

VOLUME XLVII

NUMBER 3

desk

July 1952

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

A Quarterly Journal devoted to re-
search in the Languages, Literatures,
History, and Life of Classical Antiquity

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

SEP 5 1952

PERIODICALS
READING ROOM

THE UNIVERSITY of CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITORS

RICHARD TREAT BRÜERE, *Managing Editor*

BLANCHE BEATRICE BOYER

OSCAR BRONEER

CARL DARLING BUCK

BENEDICT EINARSON

GERTRUDE SMITH

FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON

JAKOB A. O. LARSEN

RICHARD P. McKEON

RALPH MARCUS

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FREDERICK MALCOLM COMBELLACK, *University of Oregon*

PHILLIP HOWARD DE LACY, *Washington University*

AUBREY DILLER, *Indiana University*

ROBERT J. GETTY, *University of Toronto*

WILLIAM CHASE GREENE, *Harvard University*

GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON,

Yale University

VOL. XLVII

CONTENTS FOR JULY 1952

No. 3

Janus and the <i>Fasti</i>	<i>Lily Ross Taylor and Louise Adams Holland</i>	137
Thucydides on Athenian Colonization	<i>Victor Ehrenberg</i>	143
Some Notes on the <i>Agamemnon</i>	<i>A. D. Fitton-Brown</i>	150
Herodotus 4. 2	<i>E. N. O'Neil and W. C. Helmbold</i>	157
Notes and Discussions		161

GILBERT NORWOOD: Pindar *Isthmian* 8. 77.—MORTON W. BLOOMFIELD: The Source of Boccaccio's *Filostrato* III, 74-79 and Its Bearing on the MS Tradition of Lucretius' *De rerum natura*.—R. J. M. LINDSAY: *Lumina morte resignata*: A Note on *Aeneid* 4. 244.—R. F. WILLETS: A Note on *Agamemnon* 1656.—DEMETRIUS J. GEORGACAS: A Point of Koine Greek Lexicography.

Book Reviews

170

FRIEDRICH KLINGNER (ed.): *Q. Horati Flacci opera* (Hendrickson).—W. BEARE: *The Roman Stage: A Short History of Latin Drama in the Time of the Republic* (Duckworth).—W. A. LAIDLAW: *Latin Literature* (Brüere).—CHRISTIAN ALFRED FAHLCRANTZ: *Samlade latinska originaldikter och översättningar till latinsk vers*. EMANUELE CASTORINA: *Vox riueli: Carmina*. EMILIO MERONE: *Aprici flores: Carmina* (Brüere).—LUCILE KELLING and ALBERT SUSKIN: *Index verborum Iuvenalis* (Brüere).—REINHOLD MERKELBACH: *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee* (Bolling).—PENTTI AALTO: *Untersuchungen über das lateinische Gerundium und Gerundivum* (Whitnough).—E. LAROCHE: *Histoire de la racine nem- en grec ancien* (Whitnough).—DANIEL LABÉY: *Manuel des particules grecques* (Whitnough).—OTTO WEINREICH: *Römische Satiren* (Getty).—TALLEN ROGERS BENNER and FRANCIS H. FORBES: *The Letters of Alciphron, Adician, and Philostratus* (Blake).—KURT VON FRITZ and ERNST KAPP (TRANS.): *Aristotle's Constitution of Athens and Related Texts* (Larsen).—FRANCO SARTORI: *La crisi del 411 A.C. nell'Athenaion Politeia di Aristotele* (Larsen).—ALEXANDER SOUTER: *A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 A.D.* (Heller).—GABRIEL R. F. M. NACHELMANS: *Studien über φιλόλογος, φιλολογία und φιλολογίαι* (Heller).—JOSEF DELE: *Lukians Kenntnis der Athenischen Antiquitäten* (Householder).—FRITZ SCHACHERMEYER: *Alexander der Grosse: Ingenium und Macht* (Robinson).—GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING (ed.): *Ilias Atheniensium: The Athenian Iliad of the Sixth Century B.C.* (Combella).—REINHOLD STRÖMBERG: *The Aeoios Episode and Greek Wind Magic* (McCartney).—FELIX JACOBY: *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, 3. Teil: *Geschichte von Städten und Völkern* (Hörigraphie und Ethnographie), B: *Autoren über einzelne Städte* (Länder), Nr. 267-307 (Pearson).—RUDOLF FREYER (ed.): *Callimachus*, Vol. I: *Fragmenta* (Bonner).—ARISTIDE CALDERINI: *L'Ostracismo* (Raubitschek).—KARL RUPPRECHT: *Einführung in die griechische Metrik* (Hawthorne).—ELIZABETH HAZELTON HAIGHT: *The Symbolism of the House Door in Classical Poetry* (Lang).

Books Received

207

Communications for the editors and manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor of Classical Philology, Box I, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill. All manuscripts must be typed, double spaced—both texts and notes—with ample margins on firm paper (not onion-skin, etc.).

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Ave., Chicago 37, Illinois. ¶ Subscriptions are by volume only. The subscription price is \$6.00 per volume; the price of single issues is \$1.75. Orders for service of less than a full volume will be charged at the single issue rate. ¶ Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States and its possessions. No extra charge for countries in the Pan American Postal Union. ¶ Postage is charged extra as follows: for Canada and Newfoundland, 20 cents per volume (total \$6.20), 5 cents per issue (total \$1.80); for all other countries in the Postal Union, 50 cents per volume (total \$6.50), 10 cents per issue (total \$1.85). ¶ Subscriptions are payable in advance. Please make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in United States currency or its equivalent by postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following is an authorized agent:

For the British Empire except North America and Australasia: CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Bentley House, 200 Euston Road, London, N.W. 1, England. Prices of subscriptions and of single copies may be had on application.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 37, Ill.

Applications for permission to quote from this journal should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, and will be freely granted.

Microfilms of this journal are available to regular subscribers only and may be obtained at the end of the volume year. Orders and inquiries should be addressed to University Microfilms, 313 North First Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Notice to subscribers: If you change your address, please notify us and your local postmaster immediately.

Entered as second-class matter June 20, 1906, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in United States Postal Act of October 3, 1917, Section 1103, amended February 28, 1925, authorized June 6, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

7
.

ity

3

37
43
50
57
61

70

07

I,
ple

hi-
he
will
es-
da
tal
ase
er-

use,
r.
eb-
will

will

ar.

.
ion

C

V

T

Ca
loc
in
res
an
op
bes
pos
wo
Re
by
Ar
pul
Ga
the
qu
bec
dis
Pro

I
pla
sul
to
a li
anc
por
Fa
com
ann

[CLA

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XLVII

JULY 1952

Number 3

JANUS AND THE *FASTI*

LILY ROSS TAYLOR AND LOUISE ADAMS HOLLAND

The great marble blocks inscribed with the chronological list of Roman magistrates, known as the Capitoline *Fasti*, have lately been dislodged from the walls of the Regia where, in the imagination of scholars, they had rested securely for eighty odd years, and have been placed in the lateral openings of the triple Arch of Augustus beside the temple of Castor. Their new position is firmly established by the work of Professor Frank Brown on the Regia and by new evidence discovered by Professor Attilio Degrassi and the Architect, Guglielmo Gatti. Since the publication of the work of Degrassi and Gatti the attribution of the blocks to the Arch of Augustus has not been questioned by anyone; it has in fact been confirmed by additional evidence discovered independently by the late Professor Leicester B. Holland.¹

But no one has yet suggested an explanation for the inscription of a consular list on an arch. There had seemed to be excellent reason for putting such a list on the walls of the Regia, for that ancient building was the office of the pontifices, the priests in charge of the *Fasti*, Roman chronological records composed of the calendar and the list of annual consuls. For the employment of

an arch we believe that there is an explanation in the overlapping meaning of *arcus* and *ianus* and in the interpretation of Janus as the god in charge of the consular records — indeed as a god of time, a Roman variant of the Greek Chronos.

The clue is to be found in several poems of Martial and Statius written in the period when Domitian built and Nerva dedicated the new Forum Transitorium. In this forum, which systematized and beautified the Argiletum, was a Janus Quadrifrons, famous as the home of an ancient four-headed image of the god. The character of the structure is suggested by the official description of the forum, Transitorium. The Janus Quadrifrons was a two-way arch and it probably stood in the center of the forum at the crossing of the Argiletum and the street which separated the Fora of Caesar and Augustus.²

Janus, whom Martial mentions elsewhere only because his trochaic month *Januarius* was metrically impossible,³ appears in other guises in five poems of Books 8–11, written in 93–98, a period covering the last years of Domitian and all of Nerva's brief reign. The poems include allusions to the new forum and to the quadrifront character of the

Janus (10. 28), which differed from the more familiar double-headed image associated with the Janus of the Roman Forum. They stress particularly the relation of Janus with the consuls. This was an obvious connection, and it is mentioned by other writers.⁴ The consuls celebrated the formal ceremony of entrance upon office on Janus' day, the Kalends, of Janus' month, and in their sacrifice, as in most state sacrifices, Janus received the first offering. Martial, who twice uses the conventional theme of the new consuls' prayer to Janus, (8.8; 10.28.2), is specific in three poems on Janus' relation to the consular list. He calls the god creator and father of the *Fasti*:

Fastorum genitor parensque Ianus
[8. 2. 1].⁵

Martial attributes to Janus the recording of Pompey's three consulships:

Pompeio dederit licet senatus
et Caesar genero sacros honores,
quorum pacificus ter ampliavit
Ianus nomina [8. 66. 9-12].

In another epigram the poet addresses Janus as the god who for the third time has brought Nerva's name to the *Fasti*:

et qui purpureis iam tertia nomina fastis,
/ Iane, refers Nervae [11. 4. 5f.].

The contribution of Statius is in a fulsome poem (*Silvae* 4. 1) on Domitian's seventeenth consulship of A. D. 95.⁶ The poet appeals to the laws of Latium, the curule chair, and the seven hills of Rome, and bids them exult over Domitian's resumption of the office. Janus, transformed by his new forum into a god of peace, greets the new consul in a long speech:

Iipse etiam immensi reparator maximus
aevi
attollit vultus et utroque a limine grates
Ianus agit, quem tu vicina Pace ligatum
omnia iussisti componere bella novique

in leges iurare fori. Levat ecce supinas
hinc atque inde manus, geminaque haec
voce profatur [*Silvae* 4. 1. 11-16].

Janus in his greeting represents Domitian as his partner in restoring the glory of the age. Janus is very conscious of the *Fasti*; he calls on Rome and Antiquity to go through the consular records with him:

Salve, magne parens mundi, qui saecula
mecum
instaurare paras, talem te cernere semper
mense meo tua Roma cupit; sic tempora
nasci,
sic annos intrare decet. Da gaudia fastis
continua ... [17-21].

.....
Dic age, Roma potens, et mecum, longa
Vetustas,
dinumera fastos, nec parva exempla recense,
sed quae sola meus dignetur vincere
Caesar [28-30].

In these poems of Martial and Statius Janus creates and adds to the *Fasti*, and guides others in examining the records. Certain editors of Martial have explained the poet's allusions to the god by stating that the list of consuls was kept in the temple of Janus.⁷ The explanation fails to take account of the unsuitability of Janus' shrine as a storehouse of records, but the editors seem to us essentially right. We believe that a consular list was inscribed on the Janus Quadrifrons in the Forum Transitorium. There we think could be read the continuation of the consular record which on the Arch of Augustus had been carried down only to the last full year of Augustus' rule, A.D. 13.

If the Flavian Janus Quadrifrons was an arch and was inscribed with consular lists, it resembled its predecessor, the Arch of Augustus, both in its inscribed adornment and in its form of detached gate-monument. And that brings us to

the relation between the words *ianus* and *arcus*. Both are applicable to such a monument, but they express different aspects.

Arcus (which during the empire displaced the older word *fornix*)⁸ obviously concerns only the appearance of the structure, since, as applied to an architectural form, it is a metaphor, derived from the curve of the weapon or of the rainbow. To the ordinary observer, the distinguishing characteristic of an arch is not the principle of the keystone, but the curve which differentiates it from the post-and-lintel type of gateway, such as the *Tigillum Sororium* of the Horatius legend. This consisted of a straight, horizontal beam supported by two uprights — the scheme of a simple *iugum*.⁹

Although the words *ianus* and *arcus* were not, we believe, completely equivalent until the end of the classical period, both may describe the same monument. Thus an Augustan arch beside the Baetis river in Spain and three arches erected in honor of Germanicus are described both as *iani* and as *arcus*.¹⁰ But while *arcus* describes the form, *ianus* indicates function and, we believe, can properly be applied only to a gateway (whether flat-topped or arched) which marks a water crossing.¹¹ Janus Geminus in the Forum, a passageway except on the rare occasions when the brazen gates were closed in time of peace,¹² apparently stood over the Forum brook, later walled in as Rome's major sewer, the Cloaca Maxima. The Janus Quadrifrons of the Forum Transitorium seems also to have been a crossing of the same brook whose course the Argiletum followed. Statius (perhaps Martial too) bears witness to the antiquity of this Janus.¹³ We do not doubt that it existed long before the old lines of communication were embellished by the Forum Transitorium.

Since we do not believe that all arches were *iani*, it is important to determine whether the Arch of Augustus was a *ianus*. It is nowhere so described. Actually our evidence for it is derived mainly from coins and from its foundations; it is mentioned in ancient literature only twice, once by Dio as an ἀψίς τροπαιοφόρος,¹⁴ and once by a Vergilian scholiast as *arcus*.¹⁵ There was water at the spring of Juturna above the arch and there were sewers in the region, which may represent a natural drainage line.¹⁶ The site would thus accord with our view that *iani* were associated with water crossings. Before Metellus in the late second century B.C. enlarged the temple of Castor the site must have been important for communications on the north side of the Forum.¹⁷ The existence of an old *ianus* here might explain why the arch was erected in a position where from the Forum side its monumental effect was destroyed by the temple of Castor.¹⁸ There are moreover suggestions both in Horace and in Ovid that there was a Janus in this part of the Forum.¹⁹ This is the region in which Jordan located Janus Medius,²⁰ the place where debtors and creditors met to settle their accounts. One of your authors is inclined to accept Jordan's view on the position of Janus Medius. In any case we are agreed that the arch erected beside the temple of Castor may have inherited the traditions of an old Janus in the north street of the Forum.

By the Augustan period when the arch was constructed Janus seems to have become associated with the Roman official records of time, the consular list, and the calendar. This was a late aspect of the god,²¹ whose real nature, as Ovid indicates, was an enigma to the Romans. Janus probably acquired his connection with chronol-

ogy after the opening of the Roman consular year was transferred in 153 B.C. from March to January, and from Jupiter's day, the Ides, to Janus' day, the Kalends.²² The god's relation to the calendar seems also to be late, for the fingers of his statue, reputedly dedicated by Numa at the Janus Geminus, fashioned the Roman numerals CCCLXV,²³ a number which fits the year of Caesar's calendar and not Numa's.

The two types of *Fasti*, consular list and calendar, enumerations of years and days, belonged together, and at least six of the thirty-five consular lists which have come to light were accompanied by calendars.²⁴ The list of the *magistri vici* found on the Aventine²⁵ shows the close relationship between the two types of *Fasti*. Here the calendar is inscribed directly above the magisterial list. We think it likely that there were calendars with the consular list both on the Janus Quadrifrons and on the Arch of Augustus. Statius suggests the connection when he has Janus tell Domitian that there were still ten months for him to rename: *cupiuntque decem tua nomina menses*. (Domitian had already named September Germanicus and October Domitianus.) When, according to our dating, the Arch of Augustus was dedicated in 18-17 B.C. there was special reason for a new calendar, for in the preceding year there had been an important addition to Roman sacred days. In Augustus' honor a capital letter festival, the Augustalia, the first such festival to be instituted since the original publication of the calendar, had been incorporated in the Roman year.²⁶

We suggest that a calendar was inscribed in the central opening of the Arch of Augustus. That section of the monument had evidently been plundered before the remains of the structure were un-

earthed in 1546. The central opening is wide enough to provide ample room for six months of the calendar on either side.²⁷

It would be interesting to know whether any of the thirty-four consular lists besides the *Fasti Capitolini* which have come down to us were on an arch or a *ianus*, but unfortunately there is practically no information about the structures to which most of them belonged. The *Fasti Praenestini*, a calendar, was on an exedra, and there was a consular list nearby.²⁸ Two other consular lists seem to have been on the walls of buildings.²⁹ The *Fasti* of the *magistri vici* were on tablets which apparently did not form an organic part of a building. It is doubtful whether *iani* were commonly employed for such inscriptions outside Rome, for the cult of Janus had little importance in the municipalities where most of the lists have been found. But there is one interesting parallel for the position of the Roman *Fasti*. At Theveste in Africa there stands a two-way arch — a so-called Janus Quadrifrons — erected in A.D. 214.³⁰ In one of its openings is inscribed a list of public anniversaries, a calendar which continues the association of Janus and the *Fasti*.

We hope that in this paper we have shown that Martial and Statius, in poems written when Janus Quadrifrons was built or rather rebuilt in the Forum Transitorium, have provided the explanation for the Augustan inscription of Roman *fasti* on an arch. The arch that was employed was, we think, thought of as a Janus, and the god Janus had become a god of time, a god who recorded the calendar and the list of years designated by the Roman consuls. A Janus was not less appropriate than the Regia's walls as a home for a list of Roman yearly ma-

gistrates. The association of Janus and the *Fasti* persisted, we believe, in inscriptions on the Janus Quadrifrons of the Forum Transitorium and in the

calendar of public anniversaries on the arch at Theveste.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE
MIAMI UNIVERSITY

NOTES

1. See F. E. Brown, *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, XII (1935), 67-88; A. Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Italiae*, XIII.1 (Rome, 1947), 17-20, and for a fuller discussion, *Rend. pont. Accad. Rom. di Arch.*, XXI (1945-46), 57-104, with Gatti's article on the Arch of Augustus, *ibid.*, pp. 105-22. The additional evidence discovered by L. B. Holland is reported in L. R. Taylor's review article on Degrassi's work, *CP*, XLV (1950), 84-95. In that review and in a subsequent article (*CP*, XLVI [1951], 73-80) the author presents arguments for dating the Arch of Augustus in 18-17 B.C. instead of 31-30, the date accepted by Degrassi. On the Arch see also L. B. Holland, *AJA*, L (1946), 52-59 and a second paper to appear in the same journal in 1952. News of important recent excavations on the site of the arch has reached us through a letter from the excavator, Dr. R. Gamberini-Mongenet. The information we have received leads us to believe that the excavations will not affect adversely the arguments presented in this paper.

2. See Von Blanckenhagen, *Flavische Architektur und ihre Dekoration* (Berlin, 1940), pp. 45, 164 and Taf. 47.

3. See Martial 7. 8. 5; 8. 33. 11; 9. 1. 1; 10. 41. 1; 12. 31. 4; 13. 27. 1. Cf. Statius *Sil.* 1. 6. 3; Auson. *Opusc.* 3. 6. 7f.; 7. 10. 1; 7. 9. 1; 18. 24. 13f.; Arnob. *Adv. nat.* 3. 29.

4. Particularly important because of the suggestion of the relation between Janus and the *Fasti* is Lucan 5.5f.:

Instabatur dies, qui dat nova nomina fastis
Quique colit primus ducentem tempora Ianum.

See also Ovid *Epist. ex Pont.* 4. 4. 23-26; *Anth. Pal.* 9. 384. 1f.; Auson. *Opusc.* 3. 5.

5. There is a variant of the same idea in 10. 28. 1: Annorum nitidique sator pulcherrime mundi.

6. Cf. also *Sil.* 4. 3. 9f.

7. See for instance the commentaries on 8. 66 in the Delphine edition, 1822; in H. M. Stephenson's *Selected Epigrams of Martial* (London, 1914), and in Ker's Loeb edition (London, 1920).

8. *Arcus* is not cited for a monumental structure until the end of the reign of Augustus (*CIL*, XI, 1421 <restored>, a decree of A.D. 4). Architecturally the word is used before that by Varro, *ap. Non.* p. 77. 13 (of aqueducts) and by Vitruvius 5. 10. 3; 6. 8. 3; 10. 13. 7. See the *TLL*, s. v. "arcus" III.

9. See Platner-Ashby, *Topographical Dictionary*, (London, 1920), s. v. "Tigillum Sororium," pp. 538f. The Greek word ἀΐς is similarly derived from the curve of a "loop" and so also concerns the shape of the structure. See LSJ, s. v.

10. That a *ianus* need not be an *arcus* at all we know from the case of *Tigillum Sororium* (n. 9 above) and from the comparison of a military *uium* to a *ianus* (in a plausibly emended reading of *speciei ani* to *specie Iani*, Festus, p. 394.28ff. L). The arch beside the Baetis in Spain is called a *ianus* in *CIL*, II, 4697, 4701, 4703, 4715, 4716. These inscriptions date from Augustus to Vespasian. In number 4721 of the series (A.D. 90) this monument is called *arcus*. See Frothingham, *AJA*, XIX (1915), 160f. The three arches voted in memory of Germanicus are referred to in a contemporary inscription as *iani* (*CIL*, VI, 911 <31190>); Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.83) describes them as *arcus*.

11. See L. A. Holland, "Janus and the Bridge," *TAPA*, LXVI (1935), Proceedings, p. xlv. This theory, corrected and amplified, is the subject of a book now in preparation. The Spanish inscriptions cited above (n. 10) are still using *ianus* in its true meaning, since the arch marked a bridge which carried a highway over the river boundary. However, it seems that after the time of Augustus any *ianus* might be called *arcus*, but by no means could every *arcus* correctly be called *ianus*. The distinction, like that between *aedes* and *templum*, was too fine to be observed in common use, and in imperial times *arcus* came to be a general term for structures which in the Republican period would, at least in official records, be distinguished as either *fornice* or *iani*.

12. A Neronian coin (Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum*, I [London, 1923], 215, Pl. 41. 1) shows the Janus as an unroofed passage closed at both ends by double doors set in arched frames. The side walls are of squared stone with a grille along the top. The resemblance of this Janus to an arch has led to the suggestion that Janus Geminus was the prototype of the Roman monumental arch. See Sarasin, *Die Entwicklung des Triumphbogens aus dem Ianustempel* (Innsbruck, 1921); Huth, *Ianus* (Bonn, 1932), p. 62. We do not subscribe to this view.

13. Statius *Sil.* 4. 3. 9f.:

sed qui limina bellicosa Iani
lustris legibus et foro coronat.

This implies that the forum was a *corona* added to a pre-existing shrine.

14. 54. 8. 3. This is the arch of 18-17 B.C. with which L.R.T. (*op. cit.* in n. 1 above with the supplementary discussion in *CP*, XLVI [1951], 73-80) identifies the arch beside the temple of Castor. The same description is used by Dio 51. 19. 1, of the arch voted in 31-30 with which Degrassi identifies the arch of the *Fasti*. To a Greek the distinction between *arcus* and *ianus* was meaningless. So Dio (68. 1) describes Domitian's *iani* and *arcus* (*Suet. Dom.* 13. 2) collectively as ἀΐδες.

15. Schol. Ver. on *Aen.* 7. 606, in *arcu qui est iuxta aedem divi Iulii*. This is clearly a reference to the arch of 18-17, which, according to Degrassi, is not the arch under discussion.

16. A tunnel from the springs of Juturna certainly joined the brook which ran across the Forum valley in primitive times. For the hydrography see Lugli, *Monumenti Ant. Roma e Suburbio* (Rome, 1934), II, Pl. 4, or Lanciani, *Ruins and Excavations* (New York, 1897), Fig. 1. For actual remains of existing drains in the neighborhood see Blake, *Ancient Roman Construction in Italy* (Washington, 1947), p. 160.

17. For the main traffic lines through the Forum see Lugli, *Roma Antica* (Rome, 1946), p. 76; Van Buren, review of Degrassi's work in *AJP*, LXIX (1948), 103f.

18. The temple of Castor blocked the southernmost of the three passageways and interfered slightly with the central opening. Perhaps the existence of an old Janus here might explain the curious structure of this arch with side openings which were not vaulted. The evidence for the form comes from Roman *denarii* of M. Vinicius. See Gatti, *op. cit.* in n. 1 above.

19. Horace, *Epist.* 1. 20. 1, mentions a Janus with Vertumnus, whose statue stood at the Forum end of the

Vicus Tusculus. See Platner-Ashby, *op. cit.*, s. v. "Signum Vortumni," p. 489. Ovid *Rem. Am.* 561, mentions Janus with a *puteal*, presumably the *puteal Libonis*, which is usually believed to be in this part of the Forum. See Platner-Ashby, *op. cit.*, s. v., p. 434; Lugli, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

20. See Jordan, *Topographie der Stadt Rom* (Berlin, 1885), I. 2, pp. 214-19, especially n. 52. A new approach to the problem of Janus Medius is attempted in the work referred to in n. 10 above. For still another view see Axel Boethius, "Il Tempio di Giano in imo Argileto," *Acta Universitatis Gotoburgensis*, LVI (1950: 3), 32-34.

21. By an easy transition Janus had early passed from being an entrance in space to being a beginning in time, (Wissowa, *RE*¹, p. 109; Giannelli in Ruggiero, *Diz. Epig.*, s. v. "Janus" p. 8, Boethius, *op. cit.*). He seems already well established as a god of time when Pliny (*NH* 34. 33) calls him *temporis et aevi deum*. See discussion above, with n. 3. Even his two faces are explained by Macrobius (*Sat.* 1. 9. 4) by his connection with both past and present, and his four faces (*Sat.* 1. 9. 13) by the four seasons. He was said to have twelve altars for the twelve months (Varro, *ap. Macrobius Sat.* 1. 9. 16; Fonteinus *ap. Johan. Lyd. De mens.* 4. 2). See Otto, s. v. "Janus," *RE*, Supp. III, col. 1187f.; Grimal, *Le Dieu Janus* (Paris, 1945), pp. 112-17. Janus' connection with time has led some scholars to explain his origin as a god of the year and of the sun. Cf. Brelich, *Vesta* (Zürich, 1949), pp. 34, 39. By others this connection is, we believe, correctly, judged to be a later notion developed under Greek influence when the calendar had long been associated with him. Janus as Alon in Johan. Lyd. *De mens.* 4. 1 carries the association with dates back to Messala, one of the antiquarians of the late Republic.

22. Livy *Per.* 47. For the varying dates, from March to December, when the consuls entered on office, see Mommsen, *Staatsrecht* (Leipzig, 1887), I³, p. 599. For more than half a century before 153, March 15 had been the first day of office. Before that, the first day varied between the Kalends and the Ides. Ceremonies of inauguration continued to focus on Jupiter Capitolinus and Janus finds no mention in the description in Ovid *Fasti* 1. 71-78 and Johan. Lyd. *De mens.* 4. 3. Cf. Giannelli, *op. cit.* in n. 21 above; Wissowa, *RE*¹, pp. 185, 188; Burchett, *Janus in Roman Life and Thought* (Menasha, Wis., 1918), p. 13.

23. Macrobius 1. 9. 10; Plin. *NH* 34. 33; Suidas, s. v. 'Ιανουάκιος; Wissowa, *op. cit.*, pp. 105f.; Frazer, *Fasti of Ovid* II (London, 1929), p. 36, n. 4; Cook, *Zeus* (Cambridge, 1925), II, p. 366. Jordan (*Hermes*, IV [1870], 240) complains that the arrangement is *unklar*. The sculptor

could do as he pleased with his material and, when representing a god with two heads, might feel licensed to depart from anatomical accuracy in the matter of finger bones and joints. For a suggestions of conventional positions to indicate numbers by the fingers, see notes on Macrobius 7. 13. 10 in edition of Ludovicus Janus (Leipzig, 1852), where Bede's *Liber de indigitatione* is cited.

24. Calendars were found with the following consular *fasti*: the republican *Antistes Maiores*, the *Venusiani*, *Pinciani*, *magistrorum vici*, *Vallesae*, *Antistes ministrorum Aug.* For the *Fasti Praenestini* see below, n. 28. The evidence is given by Degrassi, *Inscip. Ital.*, XIII. 1, under each set of *fasti*. On the close association of the two types of *fasti*, see Degrassi, *op. cit.*, *Praefatio*, p. xlii; Hanell, *Das alttrömische eponyme Amt*, pp. 68ff., 98ff., 118f.

25. Degrassi, *op. cit.*, pp. 279-90, Pl. 87-90.

26. For the evidence, most fully recorded in Augustus' *Res Gestae* and in Dio, see Mommsen, *CIL*, I². 1, p. 330, under October 12. The naming of the Augustalia was probably decided at the same time that the arch, with which L.R.T. identifies the monument beside the temple of Castor, was voted to Augustus. Both Augustalia and arch celebrated Augustus' diplomatic victory over the Parthians.

27. The central foundation of the arch is 5.25 m. wide. The pylons of the side arches measured 65 cm. less than the foundations, and the pilasters there are 42 cm. wide. If the central pylons were similar, there would have been a space of 3.78 m. available on either side for six months of the calendar, that is 63 cm. for each month. This is a somewhat larger space than was available for the months in the *Fasti Praenestini*.

28. Suet. *Gram.* 17. See *CIL*, I². 1, p. 230. The fragmentary consular list of Praeneste (Degrassi, *op. cit.*, p. 260) is usually believed to have been inscribed at the same time as the calendar. Both calendar and consular list were found in the ancient forum of Praeneste.

29. These are the republican *Fasti Antistes* and the *Fasti Ostienses* (Degrassi, *op. cit.*, pp. 159ff., 173ff.). The latter *fasti*, accompanied by a brief annual chronicle of Rome and Ostia, differ in form from the other *fasti*.

30. Kähler, s. v. "Triumphbogen," *RE*, col. 441; Walter Snyder, "Public Anniversaries in the Roman Empire," *Yale Class. St.*, VII (1940), 297-317; on the parallel that this monument provides for the Arch of Augustus, see Degrassi, *Doza*, II (1949), 50. Janus for reasons unknown to us is more prominent in Africa than in any other province except Dalmatia. See Giannelli, *op. cit.*, n. 21 above, p. 11.

THUCYDIDES ON ATHENIAN COLONIZATION

VICTOR EHRENBURG

IN THEIR treatment of the Athenian colonization in the fifth century B.C., the authors of *The Athenian Tribute Lists* maintain that "there is never any evidence of confusion either in Thucydides or in the Attic inscriptions of the fifth century" between the terms for cleruchs and colonists, and they add in a note (Vol. III, p. 285, n. 46): "We must challenge Ehrenberg's statement (*Aspects of the Ancient World*, p. 131) that 'even in Thucydides, the expressions for the colonists themselves (ἄποικοι, ἔποικοι, κληροῦχοι) are sometimes confused, although their original meanings were evident.'" I feel that I ought to reply to this direct challenge.

The three authors and editors (henceforth in this paper called by the initials of their work: *ATL*) restrict their general statement by admitting that in their view ἄποικοι and ἔποικοι are practically the same, "differing only in meaning as do our own words 'emigrant' and 'immigrant,' and reflecting merely the point of view from which the writer envisaged the process of colonization: either from the mother-city or to the new location." I cannot quite accept even this statement; although it is a minor point, it is perhaps not without significance. The context does not provide the slightest reason why Thucydides, in speaking of the expulsion of the native populations and the settlement of Athenians in Aegina, Potidaea, and Melos, should have said πέμψαντες ἐποίκους in the two first cases (2. 27. 1, cf. 8. 69. 3; and 2. 70. 4), and ἀποίκους πέμψαντες in the last (5. 116).¹ It was, in fact, this indiscriminate use of the

two terms in exactly corresponding situations which first caused me to doubt whether Thucydides was as correct and strict in his expressions as I too had previously assumed. A colony, after all, was an ἀποικία and would never be called an ἐποικία.² If Thucydides could call the settlers either one thing or the other, it seems unreasonable to claim that he was using strictly technical language.

However, this is not the whole story, even for the passages already mentioned. The colonists who went to Potidaea, or at least some of them, made a dedication to Athena of which the inscription is preserved: ἐποίκων ἐς Ποτειδαίαν (Tod, No. 60). Accordingly we read in the fuller text of *IG*, II², 55, printed in *ATL*, II, D 21, 8ff. (428/7 B.C.): τὸν [δὲ ἔρχον ὃν ὦ]μοσαν Ἀφουαῖοι τ[οῖς ἐποίκοις] τ[οῖς] ἐμ Ποτιδαίᾳ καὶ Ἀθηνά[ιοις].³ Thus, it seems that in the case of Potidaea Thucydides follows the official use. I do not doubt that in official records the terms were always used in a technical sense; but it would be surprising, to say the least, if the Athenians when they sent colonists abroad should have spoken officially of "immigrants" unless there was some special reason for using the word ἔποικοι.

Our fullest official record of an act of colonization during this period is the well-known Brea inscription (Tod, No. 44; cf. *SEG*, X, 34). There we read again and again of the ἀποικία (ll. 5, 8, 29, 33) and the ἄποικοι (ll. 4, 14, 19, 25, 41).⁴ But in lines 26f., in the ruling for the ex-soldiers coming home later, we

read: ὅσοι δ' ἂν γράφσωντα[ι ἐποικήσειν τῷ]ν στρατιωτῶν, ἐπειδὴν ἡήκωσ[ι 'Αθή-
ναζε, τριά]κοντα ἡμερῶν ἐμ Βρέαι εἶναι
ἐπ[οικήσοντας]. The evidence for ἐποι-
κεῖν, it is true, depends on one single ε
or επ, but as far as I know, the text has
never been questioned. The word ἐποι-
κεῖν is used here to indicate additional
colonists such as Thucydides (2. 68. 5)
calls ξύνοικοι. We also read, for in-
stance, in Aristotle (*Pol.* 1303 a 28,
37): ὅσοι ἤδη συνοίκους ἐδέξαντο ἢ
ἐποίκους and ἐποίκους ἐπαγαγόμενοι. It
seems at least possible that the ἐποικοί
to Potidaea were additional colonists;
for the settlers were sent out "to
supplement the city's depleted popu-
lation" (Tod, Vol. II, No. 146). Still,
Athens took complete possession, and
Potidaea paid no further tribute (*ATL*,
III, 289). Thucydides himself, however,
does speak (twice) of ἐποικοί as addi-
tional colonists when he mentions some
people of Italian Locri who for a time
had settled in Messana (5. 5. 1).

Thus, Thucydides not only some-
times uses ἀποικοί and ἐποικοί indis-
criminately, but he also uses these two
as well as similar words in different
meanings. While ἀποικία, ἀποικοί, ἀποι-
κίζειν in more than fifty passages are
the normal terms for colonies and
colonists, we find κατοικίζειν used in
the same context and in the same sense
(1. 38. 2). Neighbors can be περίοικοι
(1. 17), πρόσοικοι (1. 7, 24. 1, 4; 2. 94;
3. 93. 3; 5. 51. 2), πάροικοι (1. 71. 2;
3. 93. 2, 113. 6; 4. 92. 5; 6. 82. 2),
ξύνοικοι (4. 64. 3), while περίοικοι are,
of course, usually the Lacedaemonian
Perioeci (1. 101.2; 3. 16. 2, 92. 5; 4. 8. 1,
53. 2; cf. also 2. 25. 3 for Elis), and
ξύνοικοι, as we have seen, could be
co-colonists (2. 68. 5). While ἐποικεῖν in
6. 86. 3 and 7. 27. 3 indicates "to
settle" or "to be established as ene-
mies," we find, apart from the passages

already mentioned, ἐποικοί simply as
colonists in 4. 102. 2 (Amphipolis) and
6. 4. 3 (Gela). Furthermore, there is the
use of the word οικήτορες, sometimes
used simply for the inhabitants of a
place (1. 2. 3, 23. 2; 2. 68.4), but more
frequently for colonists of one kind or
another (1. 26. 1, 3, 28. 1, 55. 1, 100. 3;
2. 27. 1; 3. 92. 5; 4. 49, 103. 3). In 4.
103. 3, the Ἀργιλιῶν οικήτορες in Am-
phipolis are at the same time character-
ized as being Ἀνδρίων ἀποικοί, which
may show that οικήτορες (as the word
implies) are colonists not so much
because they are emigrants or immi-
grants, but as dwellers in their new
home. Yet, the οικήτορες sent out from
Corinth to Epidamnus together with
φρουροί (1. 26. 1, 3, 28. 1) are ordinary
colonists, and it would have been pos-
sible to call them ἀποικοί just as the
town itself was accepted by Corinth as
an ἀποικία of its own (25. 2f.; cf. 26. 3,
28. 2). The very fact that Epidamnus
was really a colony of Corcyra, though
the οίκιστής had been a Corinthian,
may have influenced Thucydides to
avoid using the word ἀποικοί; but then
there are the other passages cited above
in which the οικήτορες are simply
colonists.

Only once does Thucydides speak of
cleruchs (3. 50. 2). After the revolt of
Mytilene, Lesbos was not to pay tribute,
but the Athenians divided the island
(except for the territory of Methymna)
into three thousand κληροί of which
three hundred were dedicated to the
gods: ἐπὶ δὲ τοὺς ἄλλους σφῶν αὐτῶν
κληροῦχος τοὺς λαχόντας ἀπέπεμψαν.
Here Thucydides is clearly interested
in the whole procedure, and as he
mentions κληροί he really cannot help
speaking of κληροῦχοι as well. It was
natural to use the correct terms here.
These κληροῦχοι also occur in the
slightly later decree about Mytilene

(Tod, No. 63; with tentative restorations in *ATL*, D 22). It is somewhat surprising that Thucydides, apart from this one passage, should never mention cleruchies as such. But he does mention certain acts of colonization which have frequently been regarded as cleruchies. We shall have to discuss at least some of them, without closing our minds *a priori* either way.

Of Skyros, Thucydides (1. 98. 2) only says that the Athenians enslaved the Dolopian inhabitants *καὶ ὥκισαν αὐτοί*. This verb seems in general to be used by Thucydides with reference to the foundation by an *οἰκιστής*, that is to say, to an *ἀποικία*. We find *οἰκίζειν* or *κατοικίζειν* used, e.g., for the early Athenian colonies in Ionia (1. 2. 6, 12. 4), for Notium, the harbor of Colophon, which the Athenians *κατὰ τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νόμους κατώκισαν*, settling there many Colophonians (3. 34. 4), for Amphipolis which Hagnon finally *ὥκισεν* (4. 102. 4), for the many colonies in Sicily of the various states (6. 2-5). Gomme remarks on the Skyros passage (*Hist. Commentary*, I, 281): "it became a true cleruchy of Athenian citizens, and did not pay tribute to the League." It seems that he was mistaken, and *ATL* has meanwhile tried to show that no colony whatsoever, if founded after 477, had to pay tribute. Skyros probably was an *ἀποικία*, and the only point we ought to make is that Thucydides uses a fairly vague word to describe the act. For *οἰκίζειν* or *κατοικίζειν* was also used when there was a settlement which was neither an *apoikia* nor a cleruchy (1. 103. 3; 5. 35. 7; 6 *passim* on Leontinoi).

We know already that the Athenians in 431 sent *ἐποικοί* to Aegina. They thought it was safer *τὴν Αἴγινα* ... *αὐτῶν πέμψαντες ἐποίκους ἔχειν* (2. 27. 1). Accordingly, in the famous catalogue of those who fought in Sicily

on the side of Athens, the Aeginetans appear as those *οἱ τότε Αἴγιναν εἶχον* (7. 57. 2), and in 8. 69. 3 we hear again of some *Αἰγινήτων τῶν ἐποίκων οὐδ' οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐπεμψαν οἰκῆσοντας*. It is on account of these passages that *ATL* takes it for granted (and therefore does not discuss the issue at all) that Aegina in 431 became an *ἀποικία* and not a *κληρουχία*. We have reached a crucial point in our investigation. The evidence for a cleruchy in Aegina is late, and it is understandable that *ATL*, although against the overwhelming majority of modern scholars,⁵ prefers the evidence of Thucydides. Xenophon (*Hell.* 2. 2. 3, 9) unfortunately mentions Aegina only as one of a number of cities from which the Athenians had expelled the inhabitants; he does not contribute anything to our question. Thus our only important source is Plutarch (*Pericles* 34. 2) who in general, it is true, does not clearly distinguish between the two forms of colonies. Here, however, he describes the colonization of Aegina in some detail and points out that cleruchs were given a share in the soil of the island by lot. This version is supported by the traditions (Schol. Aristoph. *Ach.* 654 and Diog. Laert. 3. 3) that Aristophanes (or Callistratus?) and Plato's father were among the cleruchs. The passage in the *Acharnians* itself is disputed, though the fear that by the loss of Aegina Athens would lose the poet as well, whatever implications there may have been which we can no longer grasp, seems to make sense only if the poet was a citizen.⁶ If, on the other hand, the tradition about him and Plato derives, as it may, from a comparatively early source (though it was perhaps pure inference or invention), it would hardly have arisen unless there had been a cleruchy in Aegina. Our previous con-

siderations will make it easier to discard Thucydides' evidence here. It is only as long as we start from the *a priori* assumption that he is always correct that we are in danger of traveling in a vicious circle. I feel we can confidently return to the earlier view that the *ἐποικιοί* in Aegina were cleruchs. A similar lack of precision can also be noticed in such phrases as οἱ . . . Ἀἰγινῶν ἐῖχον, which have their parallels in similar expressions referring, e.g., to the Athenian settlement in Hestiaeae (1. 114. 3), of which we shall presently have more to say: αὐτοὶ τὴν γῆν ἔσχον, or to Anactorium (4. 49): Ἀνακρινᾶνες . . . ἔσχον τὸ χωρίον.

If we cannot simply rely on Thucydides' use of the terms for colonists, it will be necessary to reconsider some of the events. We have dealt with Aegina in 431; on the other hand, there can be no doubt about the cleruchy in Lesbos in 427. It seems equally certain that *ἀποικίαι* were sent out to Brea, Potidaea, and Melos. But it may be useful to review to some extent the positions of Hestiaeae and Lemnos. Thucydides tells us that the Athenians expelled the inhabitants of Hestiaeae and αὐτοὶ τὴν γῆν ἔσχον (1. 114. 3). In the passage 7. 57. 2, the Hestiaeans are described as *ἄποικοι*, whether they alone, or the others mentioned as well, we shall discuss later. Our other evidence is ambiguous. Diodorus (12. 22. 2) speaks of an *ἀποικία* as well as of *κατακλήρουγεῖν* while he in 12. 7 and Plutarch, *Pericles* 23. 3 have only: Περικλῆς . . . κατώκισεν. Theopompus (*F. Gr. Hist.* 115 F 387) gives no indication except that he has the later name of Hestiaeae (or Histiaeae), namely Oreos. That name, rather surprisingly, also appears in Thucydides 8. 95. 7 (without indication that it was the same place as Hestiaeae), when only this

among the Euboean cities is reported not to have revolted: ταύτην δὲ αὐτοὶ Ἀθηναῖοι εἶχον. There is perhaps one more point in our literary evidence on Hestiaeae which should be taken into consideration, and that is that a fixed number of colonists (two thousand according to Theopompus, one thousand in Diodorus) were sent out. Such a fixed number seems to have been usual with cleruchies rather than *ἀποικίαι*, though we know of the ten thousand *οἰκῆτορες* or *ἐποικιοί*, coming from Athens and her allies and therefore not cleruchs, who settled near the Strymon and were later defeated at Drabescus (Thuc. 1. 100. 2f.; 4. 102. 2; cf. *ATL*, III, 106f.). On the other hand, we know a little more about Hestiaeae from a few fragments of one or more inscriptions (*IG*, I², 40-43, 48; cf. *SEG*, X, 37, with bibliography). There are several doubtful and disputed points; but two, as it were, contradictory facts emerge as certain. The one is that the colonists had a *βουλή* and a *δῆμος* of their own as well as *δικαστήρια* and an *ἄρχων*; the other that they paid *εἰσφορά*, the war-tax of Athenian citizens. It is obvious that in Hestiaeae features of an independent *ἀποικία* mingled with those of a *κλήρουχία*. The restriction to a fixed number of colonists may fit into the picture even if Hestiaeae was an *apoikia*. In any case, we have still to discuss Thucydides 7. 57.

The question of Lemnos (and Imbros?) is complicated because there probably were two Athenian settlements, one before 500 B.C. under Miltiades, the other after the middle of the century. I do not wish to discuss again at the present moment the status of the earlier settlers, but as to the later colonists, I am inclined to agree with *ATL* that there was a second settlement and this time certainly of cleruchs; their

settlement caused the reduction in the tribute of Lemnos. We must, however, discuss the difficult and ambiguous language of Thucydides 7. 57. In fact, much of our argument throughout this article really depends on the interpretation of that passage. Absolute certainty about its meaning can hardly be attained, but after careful second thoughts I am inclined to think that neither the translation in my earlier paper nor that of *ATL* is right.

As Thucydides tells us in §1, he is going to give a catalogue of the peoples fighting at Syracuse on either side, acting as they did not for the sake of justice or kinship, but for their own interests or under compulsion. In the following enumeration, he puts some stress on who is Ionian, who Dorian, and who neither; but generally he keeps to his programme. He first deals with the Athenian side and begins (§2) with Athens herself and that group which we have to discuss most closely. Then follow the others (§§ 3 ff.): τῶν δὲ ἄλλων οἱ μὲν ὑπήκοοι, οἱ δ' ἀπὸ ξυμμαχίας αὐτόνομοι, εἰσι δὲ καὶ οἱ μισθοφόροι ξυνεστράτευον. This division is clearly reflected in the following catalogue. Thucydides distinguishes, though only, as it were, on second thought, between the subject and tributary (ὑποτελεῖς) states and the autonomous states such as Chios and Methymna. If all these are "the rest," who are those in §2? They cannot be allies, for these are covered by the ὑπήκοοι and αὐτόνομοι. They must have been more closely attached to Athens, and there is nothing left but colonies, whether ἀποικίαι or κληρουχίαι. The only clear indication of this status are the two words ἀποικοὶ ὄντες. If they refer to the Hestiaeans only, as I held before and as *ATL* takes almost for granted, the people mentioned previously are not characterized as

colonists nor as anything else, apart from a special description added to each of them as well as to the Hestiaeans, which, however, does not give them a clear "status" as is really required. If, on the other hand, the ἀποικοὶ refer, as, e.g., the scholiast and Jowett assumed, to all the peoples mentioned in the paragraph, the word ἀποικοὶ is clearly not used in a strictly technical sense. I now believe that the other view is mistaken and that, in fact, under the general heading of "colonists" we have to include not only Aegina, but also Lemnos and Imbros.

To support this view, we must discuss the passage in greater detail. I shall print it as I now understand it, and then give my reasons.

καὶ αὐτοῖς
τῇ αὐτῇ φωνῇ καὶ νομίμοις ἔτι χρώμενοι
Λήμνιοι καὶ Ἰμβριοι,
καὶ Αἰγινῆται οἱ τότε Αἰγιναν εἶχον,
καὶ ἔτι Ἑστιαῖς οἱ ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ Ἑστιαίων
οἰκοῦντες,
ἀποικοὶ ὄντες,
ξυνεστράτευσαν.

We begin with the assumption which I have tried to prove that ἀποικοὶ ὄντες is to be connected with all the groups mentioned before. It provides the desirable common description of the four peoples mentioned. If this is accepted the words οἱ . . . Ἑστιαίων οἰκοῦντες are necessary as an expression parallel to that about the Aeginetans. Otherwise, if the Hestiaeans were already characterized by ἀποικοὶ ὄντες, the other phrase would be awkward and superfluous, and Ἑστιαίων οἰκοῦντες has therefore been deleted by some editors, although without a convincing explanation of its origin.

At the beginning of the whole sentence, αὐτοῖς is strongly stressed by its very position. This would be almost

senseless if it depended on τῇ αὐτῇ, as *ATL*, following Classen-Steup and others, assumes. It is, to say the least, unnecessary to put considerable emphasis on the fact that it was the Athenians with whom the Lemnians and Imbrians had common language and customs.⁷ It is different if αὐτοῖς belongs to ζυνεστράτευσαν, either as (ξὺν) αὐτοῖς (cf., e.g., Thuc. 2.12. 5) or, as Gomme suggests (by letter), as an ethic dative. The two words are pretty far away from one another, but that may be intentional and serve the purpose of creating a frame for the whole long sentence. We should expect the phrase "with them" or "for them" or "on their side" at the beginning of the catalogue just as in chapter 58 the enumeration of the forces on the other side begins with Συρακοσίοις δὲ ἀντεβόηθησαν. I need hardly say that our view on ἀποικοὶ ὄντες is supported by, but not necessarily dependent on, our interpretation of αὐτοῖς.

If we accept the proposed version, everything seems to fall into its place. Framed and tied together by αὐτοῖς - ζυνεστράτευσαν is the first group of peoples in the long catalogue, and they are called ἀποικοὶ. Each of them is characterized in some way. If we start from the end, the Hestiaeans are introduced by καὶ ἔτι because they are the last, perhaps an afterthought, and because the former two sections in their chiasmic order are, as it were, complete in themselves.⁸ The Hestiaeans are people who have been living in Euboea for some time past, in fact from 446 when the inhabitants were expelled. The question whether Hestiaeans were an *apoikia* or a cleruchy may still be unanswered; but with the evidence mentioned, the odds are strongly in favor of a cleruchy.

The Aeginetans are aptly described

as those "who then held Aigina," for the island was in Athenian hands from 431 to 405, and the settlers were almost certainly cleruchs. It looks as if Thucydides wrote this phrase when Aegina was again free and independent.⁹ The Lemnians and Imbrians, according to *ATL*, were partly descendants of early colonists and partly cleruchs. Whether we accept this or not, they, and they alone, not the Aeginetans and still less the Hestiaeans (here my interpretation now follows *ATL*), are described as "still speaking the same language and using the same customs." This curious description really suits only the ancient colonists of Lemnos and Imbros, whether they were originally cleruchs or not. If there were cleruchs of the period after 450, they were not taken into account separately as they did not form an independent cleruchy of their own. Under the common heading of ἀποικοὶ Thucydides lists two tributary and two non-tributary communities; the former, Lemnos and Imbros, are mentioned because they were not tributary allies like those in the following paragraphs; they had at the same time to be distinguished from Aegina and Hestiaeans; although tributary, they were ancient colonies most closely attached to Athens. Aegina and Hestiaeans, on the other hand, are mentioned because they were the only non-tributary ἀποικίαι or independent cleruchies which fought in Sicily. If no other colonies are mentioned, they probably did not take part; if no other cleruchies, they will have fought as Athenian citizens. Thus, e.g., the cleruchs in Chalcis and Eretria would not appear under the names of their present homes which remained communities of their own, and as such appear later among the ὑπήκοοι.

To sum up, I maintain that Thucydides did not use the terms for colonists

in their specific technical sense only. We need not necessarily speak of confusion. It may well be — and that is indeed the impression which at least the present writer gets from the evidence — that Thucydides used certain words in the same indefinite and varied manner as did most Greeks, sometimes as technical terms and sometimes

in a more general sense. It is this question — with the difficult interpretation of Thucydides 7. 57 — which ought, if possible, to be settled first, before a new attempt is made to define the nature of the various types of Athenian colonies.¹⁰

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

NOTES

1. It is amusing to find that the scholiast to 2. 27. 1 tries to distinguish between ἀποικοι and κληροδοχοι with regard to their regional location; the former are supposed to be sent ἐνθάτους τόπους ... οικῆσαι, the latter to the cities ὡς περὶ γῆν (?).

2. At least not in Attic. Liddell and Scott register a Locrian ἐπιφουσία in *IG*, IX, 334. 1.

3. Cf. also 20f.: [ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν τὴν Ἀθηναίων ἢ ἐπὶ τὸς ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἀθηναίων τῶν Πρωτείδαν ἔχοντας ...

4. Cf. also *IG*, I², 46, badly mutilated, but still recognizable as referring to another foundation of an ἀποικία.

5. The latest to speak of Athenian cleruchs in Aegina are H. Bengtson, *Griechische Geschichte* (1950), p. 211 and Bury-Meiggs, *History of Greece* (1951), p. 404.

6. Thus he would have been a cleruch in the strict sense, not an ἀποικος. The view that he was a metec needs no longer to be refuted.

7. This, of course, has nothing to do with the fact that the Athenians are described as αὐτοὶ ἴωνες ἐπὶ

Δωριᾶς Συγκακοσίους ἔχοντες. Language and customs of the Lemnians and Imbrians were Attic, not Ionian.

8. *ATL* connects the first two sections with ἡλθον, the verb of the passage on Athens, and leaves ἐνεστράτευσαν as only belonging to καὶ ἔτι etc. If that were true all my arguments would fall down. This kind of question, as in fact the whole discussion of 57. 2, cannot be simply decided one way or the other. I only maintain that we should not be dogmatic about it as *ATL* is. In this particular point, my interpretation is supported by the analogy of 58. 1; there ἔπειτα is used, exactly as καὶ ἔτι is here, to introduce the third member of the first group (Southern Sicily).

9. The same could be said of Hestiaeae. Thucydides (as Gomme confirms) would not have repeated τότε if it was applicable to the Hestiaeans as well.

10. When this question is fully treated, it will also be necessary to find out what substance there is in F. Hampl's suggestion of "Poleis ohne Territorium" (*Klio*, XXXII [1939], 1-60).

SOME NOTES ON THE AGAMEMNON

A. D. FITTON-BROWN

The recent publication of Professor Fraenkel's *Agamemnon* encourages me to discuss three passages of this play, and to deal with certain wider issues arising out of them.

I

τρόπον αἰγυπιῶν,
οἷτ' ἐκπατίοις ἄλγεσι παίδων 50
ὑπατηλεχέων στροφοδινοῦνται
πετρύγων ἐρετμοῖσιν ἐρεσσόμενοι
[ll.49-52].
Line 51 ὑπατοι λεχέων codd;
ὑπατηλεχέων Headlam.

The meaning of ἐκπάτιος has been much discussed. Surely it means "bewildered"? Such an interpretation is unexampled, but it would not be surprising if the semantic relationship between the Greek and English word were both literal and metaphorical.

My main concern, however, is with ὑπατοι λεχέων. This has generally been construed "supra cubilia," though most editors would agree with Blomfield in calling it "durissima constructio." Housman (*JP*, XVI [1888], 247) asserted that, as ὑπατος is a superlative, this rendering of the genitive would not do. Perhaps, as Fraenkel suggests, it might be conceded as a bold exception, but the difficulty remains.

But in my opinion the traditional reading is open to a still graver objection. Supposing we concede this genitive usage, what does ὑπατοι λεχέων mean? The answer can only be "over the nests (plural)." This is acknowledged by a number of editors, who translate accordingly. Now of course this is

out of the question, for the Atridae lamenting the rape of Helen are obviously likened to a pair of vultures grieving for the desolation of their one nest. Other editors have perceived this, and have accepted the necessary rendering, as though λεχέων were what for brevity's sake I will call a weak plural. There I demur; and I appeal once more to Housman for a remark on page xix of his edition of Juvenal. There, commenting on *Satire* 1. 168 "inde irae (P, ira Ψ) et lacrimae," he points out that the weak plural *irae* is not "the just and proper counterpart to the plural 'lacrimae', which is of another nature." Cf. also the further references to this point by Owen and Housman in *JP*, XXXIII (1914), 248 and XXXIV (1918), 42. Similarly I maintain that we should not understand a weak plural λεχέων with the plural ὑπατοι which is of another nature. Since then ὑπατοι λεχέων is capable only of a meaning which is quite unacceptable in the context, and in view of Housman's earlier objection, I feel we have no alternative but to emend. At this stage, I have nothing of my own to contribute, nor do I see the need. I wholeheartedly approve of Headlam's suggestion; and refer in particular to Mr. J.R.T. Polard's remarks on the habits of the lammergeyer in *Greece and Rome*, XVII, 116. I cannot think that the non-recurrence of the compound ὑπατηλεχής is decisive.

II

κύριός εἰμι θροεῖν ὄδιον κράτος αἴσιον
ἀνδρῶν/ἐκτελέων [ll. 104-5].

Line 104: κράτος codd., τέρας Franc-
ken.

Line 105: ἐκτελέων codd., ἐντελέων
Auratus.

I am surprised that ἐκτελέων has been challenged. Surely the aged Chorus may speak wistfully of the flower of chivalry; and surely the phrase may have influenced Lucretius' famous *prima virorum*.

But it is κράτος I wish to discuss. Most people, I think, would agree that the various interpretations advanced are thoroughly unsatisfactory. To me at least, the renderings offered by Thomson and Fraenkel suggest a desperate attempt to interpret a text whose authority is beyond question. Scarcely anyone would deny that, if Aeschylus had written τέρας, our difficulties would be resolved, and the genitive ἀνδρῶν would readily be accepted. But the editors feel obliged to defend κράτος, because "confirmant codd. Ar. Ran."; and it seems that we must now consider the problem of Aristophanic parody in order to test the strength of this confirmation.

I think that the opening of the *Helen* might profitably be considered in this connection. The first three lines are as follows:

Νείλου μὲν αἶδε καλλιπάρθενοι ῥοαί,
ὅς ἀντὶ δίας ψακάδος [Αἰγύπτου πέδον
λευκῆς τακείσης χιόνος] ὕγραίνει γύας.

In line 2, I delete Αἰγύπτου...χιόνος.

These lines are parodied by Aristophanes in *Thesmophoriazusae* 855-57:

Νείλου μὲν αἶδε καλλιπάρθενοι ῥοαί,
ὅς ἀντὶ δίας ψακάδος Αἰγύπτου πέδον
λευκῆς νοτίζει μελανοσύρμαιον λεών.

It is generally agreed that Αἰγύπτου πέδον cannot subsist with γύας in the text of the *Helen*; and we find that, in accord with our doctrine of comic con-

fimation, πέδον is upheld and γύας obelized (so Pearson and others). But just suppose we were fortunate enough to lose our copy of Aristophanes for the time being, how then should we approach the *Helen*?

In the first place, we should uphold the appropriate but rare γύας; and reject πέδον, perhaps as a suspected gloss. Then we should note the awkwardness of λευκῆς τακείσης χιόνος, for which I refer to Campbell (*CR*, LXIII [1949], 81), and add the following points. The genitive absolute implies temporal limitation — a limitation which is sufficiently natural in the prologue of the *Archelaus* (Nauck, *TGF*, 228), where we learn that the Nile fills its channels when the snows melt. But such limitation is not natural here, where we are clearly told that Egypt throughout depends upon the Nile, as other lands depend on perennial rainfall. Furthermore, we may well be distressed by the piling-up of genitives — a difficulty which we shall exasperate if we feel obliged to experiment with πέδον. Surely the natural recourse is to deletion, and I have accordingly deleted as above.

The Nile's function is now clearly stated, and the description Αἰγύπτου δ' ἀναξ in line 5 becomes natural instead of redundant.

It is at this point that we should turn to Aristophanes for light on the insertion of Αἰγύπτου...πέδον. It would be interesting to know just how he continued after ψακάδος and with what witticism in view. But for our present purpose we may rest content with knowing that he continued line 2 with Αἰγύπτου πέδον and in line 3 amused himself with some contrast of white and black. Is it not a reasonable hypothesis that the *Helen* was corrupted by a well-meaning attempt to replace a suppos-

edly lost passage from Aristophanes — a venture more auspiciously attempted in the case of the *Choephoroi*? The restorer would write in Αἰγύπτου πέδον; and then, turning to wrestle with Aristophanes' nonsense in line 3, might be encouraged by a false analogy with the prologue of the *Archelaus*.

Accordingly I submit that πέδον in Euripides is certainly corrupt, and that if my hypothesis find sympathy, we shall allow that contamination occurs between the parodies of Aristophanes and their originals. This surely brings us to the interesting suggestion made by Sir Frank Fletcher on page 9 of his notes to the *Agamemnon*: "To justify an alteration (of κράτος) we must suppose — what is not impossible — that (the Aristophanic) Euripides is deliberately and successfully making nonsense of the Aeschylean line by introducing κράτος from l. 109, and that the misquotation has found its way into the text of Aeschylus through a scribe who was familiar with the passage in the *Frogs*." This is possible, but the mistake might also have arisen by accidental corruption of either text and been transferred to the other; for as I have attempted to show, such mutual contamination is not to be ruled out.

On the whole, I consider that τέρας should be restored in both passages; and urge that I have at any rate weakened the objections to this procedure.

III

ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἦγε πάντ' ἀπὸ φογγγῆς χαρᾶ
[l. 1630].

πάντ' ἀπὸ codd.; πάντα που Rees.

On page 774 of his third volume, Professor Fraenkel tells us why we should reject Schneidewin's interpretation "delight from his voice." I agree that we should; but when he goes on to

approve Blomfield's *voeis ope*, I cannot follow. The objection was stated by Mr. D.A. Rees in *C.R.* LXI (1947), 74; and it is unfortunate that Professor Fraenkel was unaware of Mr. Rees' views before going to press. ἦγε ἀπὸ φογγγῆς means "led away from his voice" — the opposite of Blomfield's interpretation. In order to attain this latter, we must tear ἀπὸ φογγγῆς away from its governing verb of motion and construe regardless. Are there any parallels to justify this liberty? I know of two only, and they are open to discussion:

1. *Odyssey* 11. 134–36:

θάνατος δέ τοι ἐξ ἀλὸς αὐτῷ
ἀβληχρὸς μάλα τοῖος ἐλεύσεται, ὅς κέ σε
πέφνη
γῆρα ὕπο λιπαρῷ ἀρημένον.

Merry at one time (I, 122 [1870]) and Professor Stanford throughout favour the separation of preposition from verb of motion, and the rendering "Death shall come to you away from the sea." The advantage of this is that it accords with the peaceful tenor of the context, and also with ἀβληχρὸς, which perhaps means "gentle." Monro was so far impressed as to secure this result by emendation (ἐξαλός), but insisted that ἐλεύσεται ἐξ could only be taken in its natural sense. In seeking parallels, Professor Stanford justly rejects those passages where there is no verb of motion to make things difficult, cf. *Iliad* 14. 129 and *Odyssey* 15. 272; but he tentatively proposes *Odyssey* 16. 288 ἐκ καπνοῦ κατέθηκα. This parallel I cannot accept. We may by all means translate it, "I stored them away from the smoke" — but it is clear that κατέθηκα does duty for the whole process of carrying out and putting away. In any case, the interpretation is beyond dispute, while our problem is concerned

with ambiguity. Returning to the prophecy, I think there is much to be said for taking ἐλεύσεται ἐξ in its natural sense. Perhaps Homer was less merciful to his hero at the last. Odysseus tells us in *Iliad* 14. 85-87, of the sore destiny of his kind:

οἷσιν ἄρα Ζεὺς
ἐκ νεότητος ἔδωκε καὶ ἐς γῆρας τολυ-
πεύειν
ἀργαλέους πολέμους, ὄφρα φθιόμεσθα
ἕκαστος

and later legend speaks of death in various forms coming to him out of the sea. It is strange also how closely ἀβληγρός is elsewhere associated with disease. I have sometimes thought that Teiresias referred to a "wasting death" — but there are medical difficulties, and one cannot be sure. But I feel that this passage from the *Odyssey* cannot be accepted as a definite instance of the separation I am investigating.

2. Lucretius 3. 1:

E tenebris tantis tam clarum extol-
lere lumen

Qui primus potuisti inlustrans com-
moda vitae.

1: E, Mon.; O, Oblongus.

In line 1, the Munich reading has been very generally accepted, and it is capable of one interpretation, and one only. "Thou who after such great darkness didst raise so bright a beam" says Lucretius — a thought expressed by Lady Jane Grey in her *Post tenebras spero lucem*. I am agast to find that Munro translates *e* by "in" — I thought it meant "out"! But that at least is his solution of a problem which Bailey simply ignores. Bailey renders "Thou who out of deep darkness"; and (since seeing is believing I will give his reference — Vol. II, 986) he is encouraged by the similar passage at the beginning of Book 5. With apologies for the

obvious, I suggest that if a man's life is in darkness he will strive to bring it forth into light: while if he has a torch, he will keep it in the darkness, where it is usefully employed. To speak of "raising a torch out of deep darkness" would be sheer frenzy, and we are driven to admit that if the manuscript reading is sound, we must separate the preposition from the verb of motion, and construe as above.

But I bear no brief for my own rendering. *E* meaning "after" is a very doubtful usage, and we may commend Lady Jane on her choice of prepositions. Furthermore, *e* occurring in one of the less important manuscripts, and at the very beginning of a book, enjoys small authority. Frankly I think we should accept *O* from Oblongus. *Tantis tenebris* may require a preposition as the locative ablative, but surely not when regarded as a dative of disadvantage.

Returning to the passage in the *Agamemnon*, we shall not be impressed by πέφνην ἀπ' ἀργυρέοιο βιοῖο, which sheds no light upon our difficulty. I think we may well dispute the soundness of the text; and frankly I prefer Mr. Rees' πάντα που to all "the more delicate nuances of the expressions." Then we return to Stanley's *attraxit omnia vocis suavitate*; and there we might well decide to rest.

I have endeavoured to show that there are three instances where we might consider construing the preposition without reference to the verb of motion. It would be interesting to know of more. We must now ask ourselves whether, in view of these possible examples, we are justified in acknowledging the licence, and construing accordingly. For myself, I do not think so. In one case, the claims of a different rendering, in the other two cases, the claims of a different text are altogether

too strong; and I think this separation must bring further testimonials before it can be accepted into the fellowship of Greek syntax.

Two further passages require consideration for their own sake.

IV

τὸν φρονεῖν βροτούς ὁ δῶ-
σαντα, τὸν πάθει μάθος
θέντα κυρίως ἔχειν.
στάζει δ' ἐν θ' ὕπνῳ πρὸ καρδίας
μνησιπήμων πόνος, καὶ παρ' ἅ- 180
κοντας ἦλθε σωφρονεῖν [ll. 176-81].
177 τὸν Schütz; τῷ codd.
179 ἐν θ' ὕπνῳ codd; perhaps εἰν
ὑπνῳ; ἀνθ' ὕπνου Emperius.

At two points in this passage, we are faced with alternative possibilities, and in each case Fraenkel argues, in effect, that because one alternative is defensible, therefore the other must be rejected. I feel that a protest is called for.

The restoration of τὸν in 177 is justified, I think, by the parallelism of the aorist participles and present infinitives. The objection to τῷ is that it spoils the symmetrical πάθει μάθος. The quotation from Democritus, Fragment 182 is simply irrelevant — lovely things may be sought each by its own appropriate toil, but Aeschylus is not referring to the individual lessons of experience, but rather to the general effect of suffering upon the mind. Now, φρονεῖν-μάθος is repetitive, and there is no reason why this repetition should not be expressed with anaphora. Subordination would do equally well from the point of view of sense; but it is not "demanded," and should be rejected for the reasons stated. Τὸν is not certain, but more likely.

Turning to 180, we are again informed that, because καὶ can mean "even," therefore it cannot mean "and."

But I think it does mean "and," and I also incline to think that τέ in 179 can be justified. What it amounts to is that a certain process occurs "in sleep" and "against our will," with τέ . . . καὶ connecting these similar circumstances.

However that may be, the sense "in sleep" must on no account be abandoned. I think that Emperius' conjecture rests on a fundamental confusion between two sorts of πόνος — on the one hand, that remorse and anxiety for the future which derives from sin unatoned; on the other, that pain which comes from recollecting the suffering whereby past sin was purged. Clearly it is the latter πόνος, which Aeschylus has in mind; and past suffering causes not wakefulness but exhausted sleep. In this sleep, the heart bleeds for the recollection of suffering:

Ut te post multa tuorum
Funera, post varios hominumque
urbisque labores
Defessi aspicimus!

But sleep remains to cherish the wounded spirit.

"In sleep" must therefore be retained, and I think that the manuscript reading is sound. But if we still insist on rejecting the particle, then surely it would be better to accept the rare εἰν, than to sacrifice a very precious thought.

V

τὰ μὲν ποδῆρη καὶ χερῶν ἄκρους κτένας
ἔκρυπτε· ἄνωθεν <ἐγκασιν κεκυρμέν-
νοὺς·
οὐδ' ἦσθεθ' ὁ πατήρ> ἀνδρακὰς καθή-
μενος·
ἄσημα δ' αὐτῶν αὐτίκ' ἀγνοίᾳ λαβῶν
ἔσθει βορὰν ἄσωτον, ὥς ὄραξ, γένει.
ἁπτεῖ· ἐπιγνούς . . . [ll. 1594-98].

1595: ἔκρυπτε, Casaubon; ἔθρυπτε, mss. After ἄνωθεν, Wilamowitz postu-

lates the lacuna, which I have supplied.

1596: ἄσημα δ' αὐτῶν, codd; ἄσημα· ὁ δ' αὐτῶν, Dindorf.

I agree with Fraenkel that the manuscript reading must be retained in 1596, and that the change of subject indicates a lacuna after ἄνωθεν in 1595.

With regard to ἀνδρακάς (= ? = ἀνὴρ-ἐκάς), the lexicographers are persuaded of the rendering "man by man" by instances no longer available. Possibly they are mistaken, but in any case we are justified in considering our extant occurrences on their merits. Both, in my opinion, suggest the meaning "one man apart." In *Odyssey* 13. 14, Alcinoüs decides on a further presentation to Odysseus, who, we are reminded, has already done very nicely out of the thirteen princes of 8. 390. Alcinoüs now calls upon the assembled banqueters for — what? A large tripod and cauldron — so large in fact that, although of bronze, they had better be purchased by subscription — from each banqueter?!! Transport must have presented a problem, and we can only hope that Athene found her cave close at hand. And do a host of bronze cauldrons form the ideal present for one man?

I suggest that Odysseus has already had enough expensive presents from the princes, and that Alcinoüs was now calling upon the banqueters for a general token of esteem. This token must be supplied by somebody, but as no one man could be expected to bear the expenses of a whole company, the others should all go round collecting on his behalf. This interpretation provides us with a more natural rendering of ἐνὰ ποικίλῳ, and Odysseus with a more manageable present. In line 20, the gifts which Alcinoüs stored out of harm's

way were presumably easier to damage than bronze. No doubt the cauldron stood in the open.

Accordingly we shall not be surprised to find ἀνδρακάς with the singular καθήμενος in *Agamemnon* 1595. We shall agree with Professor Fraenkel in taking it of Thyestes sitting apart by himself.

But ἔθρουπε is quite unacceptable. Toes and fingers are constituted of bone, and would be altogether unsuitable for garnishing a dish. And if they are not in the dish, why bother to break them up? Fraenkel is also unhappy with ἄνωθεν, which is more appropriate to a pie or pudding than to a stew.

Moreover, ἔθρουπε would mean that the fragments were unidentifiable, and we have to assume that Thyestes was eventually told what had happened. This is very flat, and the story is better related in Herodotus, where the identifiable parts are kept aside. There is no reason to think that this was done here; but I think that a still grimmer account is fully presented. Thyestes needed no one to tell or reveal the truth, for it lay awaiting him. Atreus placed the identifiable parts in the bottom of the dish and "concealed them from above" by covering with the unidentifiable flesh. So Thyestes gorged until he came upon the lurking horror. Remembering lines 1220-21, we may be pardoned for conjecturing ἔγκασιν, together with κεκρυμμένους as an indignant repetition. The lacuna may then be explained in terms of haplography.

Translation is now quite simple: "He took the fingers and toes, and concealed them from above — concealed them beneath the entrails; nor did the father mark him, for he sat aside by himself. And for the indeterminate parts, he straightway took of them all unwitting, and made a meal fraught, as thou seest,

with doom for all his race. Then when he knew of it"

This reconstruction is tentative, but the speech would not be inappropriate in the mouth of Aegisthus. I claim it as

the most lucid and satisfactory explanation put forward to date.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF NORTH WALES
BANGOR

HERODOTUS 4.2

E. N. O'NEIL AND W. C. HELMBOLD

Τοὺς δὲ δούλους οἱ Σκύθαι πάντας τυφλοῦσι
τοῦ γάλακτος εἵνεκεν τοῦ πίνουσι, ποιεῦντες ὧδε.

IN THIS way Herodotus begins what promises to be an incredible tale with even stranger logic.¹ Does he mean to assert that the blinding of the captives gave them greater proficiency in their single task? One might, perhaps, believe that such an opinion was in the mind of the author if it were not for the concluding sentence of this chapter:

τούτων μὲν εἵνεκα ἅπαντα τὸν ἄν
λάβωσι οἱ Σκύθαι ἐκτυφλοῦσιν· οὐ γὰρ
ἀρόται εἰσι ἀλλὰ νομάδες.

This statement, coming as it does at the very end of the chapter, arouses a suspicion that it may have been added by Herodotus at a time later than that of the main composition, when he came to realize that the section as it stood was obscure. At any rate, it would seem reasonable to suppose that, in Herodotus' opinion, the Scythians had for their slaves no task which required men with normal sight, or else that the manufacture of this milk product² was such a large task that it required all the time and efforts of the slaves.³ In either case, and this is one of the most peculiar features of the story, the slaves are not again mentioned by Herodotus: after the conclusion of 4. 4, they vanish from sight; we are left wondering what they were doing during the Persian invasion, the only time when the Scythians occupied anything like a prominent place in the history reported by our author.

If Herodotus meant the last sentence of 4. 2 to be his final explanation, it seems very probable that he knew or believed certain other considerations

which led him to make such a statement. Are there any hints of such knowledge or belief in his history? He has the Scythian Idanthysrus say to the Persians: "We have neither cities nor tilled earth."⁴ By this statement alone the majority of tasks which are prevalent in most civilizations is accounted for; we see at once that no one, slave or free man, was required for manufacture, construction, or any of the other occupations which accompany urban life; at the same time all phases of agricultural life are discounted, for the absence of tilled land indicates that there was no life on the farm. (We shall return later to this point.)

Since two sources of employment have been eliminated, what else is left for the slave to do? Men who lead a nomadic life have for their main occupation the herding of cattle, horses, sheep, and the like. Who tended these animals? ὅπως τῶν προβάτων τῶν σφετέρων αὐτῶν καταλίποιν μετὰ τῶν νομέων, αὐτοὶ ἂν ὑπεξήλαυνον ἐς ἄλλον χῶρον.⁵

This would seem to answer our question: we see that they did indeed have herdsmen; and, if we are to accept the statement that the Scythians blinded all their slaves, we must assume that these νομεῖς were free men:⁶ οἱ δὲ εἰσι Σκύθαι ἐγγενέες· οὗτοι γὰρ θεραπεύουσι τοὺς ἂν αὐτὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς κελεύσῃ, ἀργυρώνητοι δὲ οὐκ εἰσι σφι θεράποντες.⁷

Here, in speaking of the attendants of the king, Herodotus shows that native Scythians were used for servile

tasks. This passage, together with the preceeding one, seems to demonstrate the curious fact that one tribe of the Scythians was so far superior to the others that it considered the rest to be, in fact if not in name, its slaves.⁸ So again we find a task which might have been assigned to slave labor entrusted instead to native Scythians.

Thus far an attempt has been made to justify Herodotus' logic, but of course his true meaning can be matter only for speculation. Although such reasoning may have satisfied Herodotus, scholars have expressed grave doubts about its validity and have consequently formulated a number of attempts to solve the problem. These critics may be divided into three main groups: First, there are those who would alter the text or merely disregard the statement as being illogical.⁹ Secondly, there is a group which tries to find some proof to substantiate Herodotus' argument.¹⁰ To the third group belong scholars who have turned to other sources to find some speculative explanation for the genesis of the tale.¹¹

A consideration which many critics have overlooked in their attempts to interpret 4. 2 is the organization of the Scythian nation. Minns states that "the governing condition of the nomads' existence was the necessity of finding natural pasturage for their herds, hence their moving from place to place, and this necessitated everything from the form of their dwellings to the cut of their clothes, from the tactics in warfare to their method of cooking."¹² In other words, the guiding principle was the satisfaction of grazing requirements only. Before proceeding further, then, let us examine the Scythian kingdom as it existed in the time of Herodotus.

The Scythians were a conquering race

who were seldom, if ever, in numerical superiority. They were, however, well organized and so were able to superimpose upon the sedentary agricultural population their own form of organization.¹³ The subjects of the Scythians seem to have been relegated to a distinctly inferior position in the state, for the Scythian kingdom was founded upon a feudal system¹⁴ with the Royal Scythians at the top and the slaves at the bottom. It was further divided into four sections, each of which had its own petty ruler who was responsible to the chief king. The latter was in all probability the military chief of the Royal Scythians, who lived in an armed camp.¹⁵

These arrangements, while seemingly simple in themselves, have caused confusion because the pursuits of life differed, under this type of government, in the various sectors. It seems very probable¹⁶ that the same nation contained both farmers and nomads, for the tribes which are described as tillers of the soil¹⁷ must have been the original inhabitants of the land who had been more or less assimilated into the Scythian nation by the invaders. The nomadic Scythians, on the other hand, were descendants of the original invaders together with other peoples whom they had subjugated. This accounts for the fact that the Royal Scythians "looked upon the rest of the Scythians in the light of slaves,"¹⁸ and held in their possession the gold which was sacred from ancient tradition,¹⁹ since they were the original Scythians, while the others bore that appellation only in a political sense.²⁰

From such an outline of the Scythian kingdom we obtain one dominant notion: To maintain control over their empire, in view of their numerical inferiority, the Scythians had to be firm

with their subjects. This necessity accounted for the fact that the king of the Royal Scythians had native Scythians as his servants and that the herdsmen were left behind as bait for the Persian invaders, while the rest of the Scythians retreated to a safe distance.

Again, considering the perilous situation which the Scythian overlords occupied at all times, we may comprehend how they became a violent and selfish group; Herodotus himself realized that the Scythians were a cruel, often an inhuman, people. Consider first his statement: ἐπὶ μὲν νυν ὀκτῶ καὶ εἴκοσι ἔτεα ἦρχον τῆς Ἀσίης οἱ Σκύθαι καὶ τὰ πάντα σφι ὑπὸ τε ὕβριος καὶ ἀλγυρίης ἀνάστατα ἦν.²¹

What term but cruel can be applied to a nation that beheaded enemies and made drinking cups of their skulls;²² that flayed opponents and made use of their hides;²³ that proudly showed off to visitors skulls of kinsmen slain in feuds?²⁴ Human sacrifice was, of course, not unknown to antiquity; yet what but extraordinary shall we call a people who treated their human victims as did the Scythians?²⁵ These and many other instances of barbarism²⁶ are related by our historian, who, it would seem, failed to understand the connection between such procedure and the blinding of the slaves.

There remains one more important point: ξεινικοῖσι δὲ νομαίοισι καὶ οὗτοι ἀνῶς χρῆσθαι φεύγουσι.²⁷ Of this "extreme hatred" Herodotus gives us two examples: the death of Anacharsis²⁸ and the overthrow and death of Scyles.²⁹ From such feeling may have arisen the notion that it added greatly to the prestige and glory of the individual warrior to kill as many of the enemy as he could;³⁰ and since it was a great glory to kill in battle, would it not be an even greater honor to capture and bring back alive a

portion of the defeated enemy? Since a Scythian was held in high esteem if he could display the skulls of slain enemies, would there not be greater glory in having around his wagon the living proof of his bravery? It may be that in the time of Herodotus the blinding of captives was merely an ancient custom; in fact the Scythian warrior of that age may no longer have realized why he treated his γέρον in such a manner. The Scythian, however, as shown above, was in a very precarious position because of his numerical inferiority; it may be that this fact first made him realize that he would have to adopt some means of insurance against a slave uprising. Because of his natural or developed cruelty a method of blinding these unfortunate creatures was adopted; since this method had proved to be effective in ages past, the Scythians even dared to leave their wives and children unprotected in the midst of these sightless slaves.

Hippocrates³¹ states that the Scythian married women were confined closely to their wagons. May it not have occurred to the Scythian husbands that women and slaves might participate in just such a situation (4. 3) as actually happened when they were gone? Yet, since they knew that the man is usually the aggressor in such an affair, they thought they could effectively check any such tendency in slaves without destroying their usefulness. How were the Scythians to guess that, once they were out of the way for a long time, the women themselves would assume the role denied to the slaves?

To summarize, then, the contention of this rather involved argument: the mere statement of Herodotus 4. 2, that the Scythians did indeed blind their slaves and use them for the manufacture of koumiss, may be accepted

without too much misgiving. The reason, however, for this practice is apparently not that which Herodotus implies; it is rather to be sought in other Scythian characteristics, and predominantly in their native and wanton lust for cruelty. The wonder is that the arrogant Scythians should have shown enough pa-

tience to train the blinded and semi-helpless creatures in the delicate process of koumiss-manufacture; or was this sedentary task, in part, relegated to the female?³²

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

NOTES

1. A. D. Godley (L. C. L. ed. *ad loc.*) explains the blinding as an attempt on the part of the Scythians to keep their slaves from stealing the best part of the product. Stein (*ad loc.*) thinks that an etymological confusion is the basis for the story.

2. It is now generally thought to have been koumiss, not cream. Koumiss is still prepared by the Calmucks and others.

3. Herodotus himself intimates that it was their chief food in 1. 216 where a description of the Massagetae is given in terms of a comparison with the Scythians; but even so would this preparation require all the time and efforts of the slaves?

4. Hdt. 4. 127.

5. 4. 130.

6. E. H. Minns (*Scythians and Greeks*, p. 84), says: "Their raids brought the Scyth slaves, employed in herding cattle and making koumiss, but among the nomads, master is not far above man, and so thought the mistress when the master was away." This witty statement seems to be questionable if we are to believe Herodotus' story of the blinding of all slaves. R. W. Macan (ed. Hdt. 4-6, *ad loc.*) agrees with Minns to the extent that he believes νομῆς definitely means "slave" while αἰῶνι refers to their Scythian masters. Rostovtzeff (*Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*, p. 43), is, perhaps, somewhat closer to the truth: "The herds were kept by subjects whose status did not greatly differ from that of slaves." But there was a difference: for one thing, they were not blind.

7. Hdt. 4. 72.

8. 4. 20. According to Powell's indispensable *Index-Lexicon*, which we have never found to be wrong upon such points, δοῦλος, as literal "slave," occurs in Book 4 only in the first three chapters; thereafter it is used only twice in the present chapter and in 142, to designate the Ionians.

9. Here belong W. W. How (*Commentary, ad loc.*), who says: "The information in this chapter is better than the logic"; Stein, who suggests that the whole story was a later addition; J. E. Powell, who says: "What the manufacture of koumiss has to do with the blinding of slaves is a mystery; apparently Herodotus himself had no clear idea"; Neuman (*Die Hellenen im Skythenlande*, p. 278), believes that there must be at least one lacuna, if not more; and this possibility is not one to be dismissed lightly. F. L. Lindner (*Skythien und Skythen des Herodot*, p. 150, n.), says confidently: "Wir sind überzeugt, daß wie im Deutschen, die Worte blenden und blasen aus Versehen verwechselt werden können, dies auch im Griechischen mit τυφλόω und φυσάω von den Abschreibern geschehen sei; dem gemäß dann die Construction abzuändern wäre." There seems to be no more similarity between τυφλόων and φυσάω—or for that matter, blenden

and blasen—than there is between our "blow" and "blind."

10. Rawlinson, *ad loc.*, says: "The Scythians, being a pastoral people, could manage with blind slaves; and by blinding their slaves render it impossible for them either to revolt or run away." This is a clear and logical statement and seems to be on the right track.

11. For instance, Rostovtzeff (*Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*, p. 39), says that the whole story was merely a legend whose origin lay in the unsuccessful attempts of the Scythians to penetrate the Taman peninsula.

12. *Op. cit.*, p. 48.

13. Rostovtzeff, *op. cit.*, p. 8. Note that Hdt. 4. 81 expressly states that the number of genuine Scythians was unknown, though he had endeavored to ascertain it.

14. Rostovtzeff, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

15. *Ibid.*, p. 43.

16. In spite of 4. 127 cited above and Minns *op. cit.*, pp. 35-36.

17. Hdt. 4. 18: Σκόθαι γεωργοί. Part of the confusion arises from the ambiguity involved in Hdt.'s use of "Scythian."

18. 4. 20. Cf. note 8 above.

19. 4. 7.

20. Rostovtzeff, *op. cit.*, p. 92, calls attention to the fact that graves which have been excavated revealed different social levels among the Scythians: some of the graves have yielded rich finds, while others have produced little or nothing.

21. Hdt. 1. 106.

22. 4. 65.

23. 4. 64.

24. 4. 65.

25. 4. 62.

26. If further illustration is required, see 4. 69 and 72.

27. 4. 76.

28. 4. 76-77.

29. 4. 78.

30. That this is so can readily be seen from the description in 4. 66.

31. Ed. Kühlewein, Vol. I, p. 60, 21: *De aere aquis locis* 18. Whoever may be the author of this part of the Hippocratic Corpus (see, among much recent work, L. Edelstein, *Περὶ αἵματος und die Sammlung d. Hippokratischen Corpus, Problematika IV*, 1931, esp. pp. 178-81; H. Diller, *Gnomon*, IX [1933], 65ff.), it is not at all impossible that it was written, or put together, in the 5th century, possibly during Herodotus' lifetime.

32. The proximity of the women and the slaves, both being confined in the same way, was bound to be considerable; the conflagration, when it came (4. 3), may or may not have occurred beside a brimming bucket. In either case, it is an interesting and a pathetic picture.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

PINDAR ISTHMIAN 8. 77

All editors print the verse thus: ἤβαν γὰρ οὐκ ἄπειρον ὑπὸ χειρὶ καλῶν δάμασεν. That is the reading of two Triclinian manuscripts, but D (our only good authority, as B ceases at 58 and the scholia at 133 = 67) gives ἤβαν γὰρ οὐκ ἄπειρον ὑπὸ χόα πω καλῶν δάμασεν,

with faults of both sense and meter. These, like the cessation of B and the scholia, together with Triclinius' substitution of χειρὶ and omission of πω, suggest a blurred original. It should be added that Bury and Christ think χία (Tycho Mommsen χίτα) possible; Schroeder says "χόα (vel χειά)."

The *textus receptus* is explained by all except Bury in the same way, e.g.: "iuventutem enim non expertem praeclarorum conatuum in latibulo desidia fregit" (Dissen); Sandys more literally translates ὑπὸ χειρὶ by "in a hole." This must be rejected, for two reasons.

Firstly, it errs about δάμασεν. Farnell (II, 384f.) would put things right by the familiar but ruinous method of dilution: "δάμασεν has a wide and vague meaning—to subdue, tame, damp down; and after all one might be said 'to damp down fiery youth by burying it in a hole' that is, by staying at home." *Non tali auxilio!* δαμάζω always means "conquer," "quell," and nothing else. It could be used of refusing high achievement only if such refusal were offered by a fine soul that wrestled with its own passion for renown, let us say: a thought impossible here. The nearest approach is in sentences of the "keep your temper!" kind, such as *Il.* 18. 112f. (θυμὸν δαμάσαντες) and *Theognis* I. 1235 (δαμάσας φρένας).

Secondly, though the literal translation of ὑπὸ χειρὶ is "down in a hole," we must not be misled by similar-sounding English phrases: "hole-and-corner doings" or "what a hole!" These are contemptuous. That ὑπὸ χειρὶ also can be contemptuous in classical Greek, is a baseless as-

sumption: Triclinius, who (so far as appears) is responsible for this reading, lived some eighteen centuries later than Pindar. Now, in the few places where I have seen χειά, it means the hole of a serpent, or once (Oppian *Halieut.* 4. 618) that of a fish. "Pindar" uses it in a metaphorical sense. No other writer does so; but Homer employs it twice in one simile (*Il.* 22. 93-95). There, so far from being derisive, it imports formidable power ready to strike—at that great moment when Hector turns to await Achilles. Is it likely that Pindar, so familiar with Homer, would use χειά as a term of contempt? So Plutarch (*De superst.* 169 E) mentions χειὰ δρακόντων as spots that one approaches with wretched misgiving; compare also the well-known passage about "the hole of the asp" (*Isaiah* 12: 8), where, however, the word is τρώγλη. Schroeder (p. 527 of the Appendix to his *Pindar*) errs badly in translating our phrase by "im Mauseloch." When Pindar wishes to say what his commentators here allege that he means, he words it thus (*Ol.* 1. 82ff.):

Θανεῖν δ' οἷσιν ἀνάγκη, τὰ κέ τις ἀνώνυμον
γῆρας ἐν σκότῳ καθήμενος ἔποι μάταν,
ἀπάντων καλῶν ἄμμορος;

Wilamowitz (*Pindaros*, p. 196, n. 2) announces that "Weder die χειά gibt Sinn noch das δαμάζειν... Heilen kann ich nicht."

The first step is recognition that δάμασεν alludes to victory in athletic contests, as in *Ol.* 9, 91-94:

Φῶτας δ' ὀξυρεπεῖ δόλω
ἀπτῶτι δαμάσσαις
διήρχετο κύκλον ὄσσα βοῶ,
ῥαίτις ἐὼν καὶ καλὸς κάλλιστα τέ βέξειαι.

Cf. *Pyth.* 8. 79f.—The ἤβα οὐκ ἄπειρος is not Cleander's, but that of his opponents: Pindar stresses their vigour and training in compliment to him who overcame these.

Who are they? Of course, the Megarians and Epidaurians just mentioned (74f.):

ἐπεὶ νιν Ἀλκαθόου τ' ἀγῶν σὺν τύχῃ
ἐν Ἐπιδαύρῳ τε νεότας δέκετο πρὶν.

νεότας there is echoed by ἦβαν in our verse. Herein we have been anticipated by Bury, who published his edition some sixty years ago, hitherto (so far as I am aware) receiving no acknowledgement save a snub from Farnell (*loc. cit.*). No matter: Farnell more than once boxes the ears of the Theban Eagle himself.

But ἦβαν δάμασεν, though it undoubtedly means "quelled sturdy young opponents," is too curt for Pindaric style. We need an actual word for them here: cf. *Pyth.* 1. 45, μακρὰ δὲ ῥίψαις ἀμεύσασθ' ἀντίους. I propose ἀντίων in place of πω καλῶν. The original of D, as we said, must have been blurred, and the otherwise unaccountable πω can obviously be a miswriting of τιω, the remains of ἀντίων. In that case καλῶν must have been inserted to provide ἀπειρον with a genitive, which it has in *Frag.* 131 (Bowra), πόνων τ' ἀπειροι: cf. *Ol.* II. 18, ἀπείρατον καλῶν. It is, however, by no means indispensable: cf. *Isth.* 8. 52f.,

νεαρὸν ἔδειξαν σοφῶν
στόματ' ἀπείροισιν ἀρετὰν Ἀχιλῆος.

Finally, what of D's ὑπὸ χόα (or χία) and Triclinius' ὑπὸ χειῖ? The latter's verse, omitting πω, scans correctly; but χειῖ, we saw, calls for emendation. Bergk thought of ὑπὸ χρεῖα: ὑπό, no doubt, to be taken with δάμασεν by tmesis. That gives a sentence both awkward and ob-

scure. Farnell (*loc. cit.*) would improve on this with ὑπὸ χρεῖᾱ "if the phrase is desperate"; and translates the result by "he did not quell his youthful ardour in dearth of noble ventures." But what then happens to ἀπειρον? Turyn remarks "fortasse ὑπέχων πω." This produces a sentence that I at least cannot grasp.

If, on the other hand, we read ἀντίων, any emendation of ὑπὸ χειῖ must have three syllables only, with the quantities ˘ ˘ ˘. I propose ὑπόχειρ', agreeing with ἦβαν. This word, which has the sense of ὑποχείριος, "held down" or "subjected," does not occur beyond question in extant Greek, but certainly should not be condemned. It was postulated by Musgrave in order to correct the unmetrical ὑπὸ χειῖρα in *Soph. El.* 1092. This emendation has been generally accepted by scholars, including Jebb, who points to the analogous ἐπίχειρ and ἀντίχειρ; in that *locus vexatus*, *Pyth.* 8. 77f., Tycho Mommsen also used it, suggesting ὑποχείρων μέτρον, "in the manner of the oppressed." We thus arrive at a verse that may be thought at once lucid and attractive:

ἦβαν γὰρ οὐκ ἀπειρον ὑπόχειρ' ἀντίων δάμασεν.
"For by mastery of hand he conquered the skilled vigour of his adversaries." To reinforce δάμασεν by ὑπόχειρα is exactly right when speaking of a wrestler. This hold is shown in vase-paintings: see (for example) Schroeder, *Der Sport im Altertum*, p. 126.

GILBERT NORWOOD

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE SOURCE OF BOCCACCIO'S *FILOSTRATO* III, 74-79 AND ITS BEARING ON THE MS TRADITION OF LUCRETIIUS, *DE RERUM NATURA*

Somewhat over forty years ago, Professor Albert S. Cook of Yale University made a study of the ultimate classical and Italian sources of Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* III, 1-38 and its immediate source, Boccaccio's *Filosttrato* III, stanzas

74-79 (*ca.* 1338).¹ In it he pointed out the parallels which occur between the invocation to Venus of these Boccaccian stanzas and that of Lucretius at the beginning of the *De rerum natura*.² Yet, in spite of his recognition of the probable dependence

here of Boccaccio on Lucretius, he, although perhaps not completely convinced, seems to go along with Munro's statement that no Italian writer before the fifteenth century shows any knowledge of the Latin poet. Cook also points out, however, that there are possibly two further Lucretian echoes or quotations in Boccaccio's work—in the *De genealogia deorum*.³ The purpose of this note is to call to the attention of classical scholars Cook's suggestion and its implications, and to urge that Boccaccio did indeed know something of the *De rerum natura*.

None of the recent editors of the *De rerum natura* has paid any attention to this possibility and its bearing on the history of the Lucretian manuscripts. For, if we recognize Lucretius as Boccaccio's source in this part of his notable treatment of the Troilus and Cressida story, it must follow that our picture of the manuscript tradition of the *De rerum natura* needs modification and that Lucretius' poem or at least part of it was known in Italy some eighty years before Poggio Bracciolini's discovery of a codex in 1418, to which all extant Italian manuscripts of the poem are usually traced back. It is also possible that this fact, if established, will explain generally some of the variants in the Italian manuscripts which cannot be explained by Niccolò de' Niccoli's copy of Poggio's text (Biblioteca Laurenziana 35.30), the commonly accepted archetype. Manuscript F (Laurenziana 35.31) in particular may rest on the text Boccaccio used as well as on Niccolò's copy. In other words, there may be more than one Italian archetype.

The relevant selection from the *Filosttrato*, which is put into the mouth of Troilus after his conquest of Cressida, reads as follows:

—O luce eterna, il cui lieto splendore
fa bello il terzo ciel dal qual ne piove
piacer, vaghezza, pietate ed amore,
del sole amica, e figliuola di Giove,
benigna donna d'ogni gentil core,
certa cagion del valor che mi move,
a' sospir dolci della mia salute,
sempre lodata sia la tua virtute.

Il ciel, la terra ed il mare e lo 'nferno,
ciascuno in sé la tua potenza sente,
o chiara luce, e s'io il ver discerno,
le piante, i semi e l'erbe parimente,
gli uccel, le fiere e' pesci, con eterno
vapor ti senton nel tempo piacente,
e gli uomini e gl'iddii; né creatura
sanza di te nel mondo vale o dura.

Tu Giove prima agli alti effetti lieto,
pe' quai vivono e son tutte le cose,
movesti, bella dea, e mansueto
sovente il rendi all' opere noiose
di noi mortali, il meritato fletto
in liete feste volgi e dilettose,
e 'n mille forme già quaggiù 'l mandasti,
quand' ora d'una ed or d'altra il piagasti.

Tu 'l fiero Marte al tuo piacer benigno
ed umil rendi, e cacci ciascuna ira;
tu discacci viltà e d'alto sdegno
riempi chi per te, dea, sospira;
tu d'alta signoria merito e degno
fai ciaschedun, secondo ch'el disira;
tu fai cortese ognuno e costumato
che del tuo foco alquanto è infiammato.

Tu 'n unità le case e le cittadi,
li regni e le provincie e 'l mondo tutto
tien, bella dea; tu dell'amistadi
se' cagion certa e del lor caro frutto;
tu sola le nascose qualità
delle cose conosci, onde il costruito
vi metti tal, che fai maravigliare
chi tua potenza non sa ragguardare.

Tu legge, o dea, poni all'universo,
per la quale esso in esser si mantiene;
né è alcuno al tuo figliuolo avverso
che non sen penta, se d'esser sostiene;
ed io che già con ragionar perverso
gli fui, agual, sí come si conviene,
mi riconosco innamorato tanto,
ch'espriemer giammai non potrei quanto.⁴

Set alongside Lucretius' invocation, the passage from Boccaccio shows striking similarities and argues for a source relationship. The points in common are: (1) An emphasis on the all-pervasive power of Venus in the various parts of the cosmos. (2) The specifying of the effects of Venus on plants, birds, fish, and animals. And most striking of all (3) the use of the image of Venus softening the might of Mars.

Although there are no close verbal

parallels, the sequence of the Lucretian thought is closely followed in Boccaccio. In fact, Boccaccio develops the ideas more fully and in greater detail, but as far as the two passages run parallel,⁵ the structure of the argument is the same. In particular, the similar picture of Venus vanquishing the might of Mars is most remarkable. Among the many parallels and possible sources which Cook lists in his article, only in Lucretius do we find this allusion to Venus' pacifying power over her warrior lover.

The basic image applied to the power of Venus by Boccaccio is that of light. In this no doubt the poet was much influenced by medieval *Lichtmetaphysik* and possibly by Plutarch.⁶ Yet even in Lucretius there is at least one line (22-23) which may have made possible the bridge in Boccaccio's mind to the light image:

nec sine te quicquam dias in luminis oras
exoritur. . . .

Lucretius elsewhere in the poem also uses further light imagery. He could very well have been at the root of the creation of the figure in Boccaccio's mind.

The formal similarity between the two passages also provides a further argument; for these parallels in meaning, thought sequence, and imagery are found in the form of eulogistic invocations serving as exordia either to a work as a whole as in the case of Lucretius or to a new and important section in the development of a work as in the case of Boccaccio. The points of similarity occur, then, in a similar poetic and rhetorical context, in an amalgamation of meaning and form which transcends a mere enumeration of detailed similarities. They are greater than the sum total of their parts in strengthening the overall impression of indebtedness.

A comparison of the source here suggested for this passage in the *Filostrato* with that often offered will, I believe, reinforce the case argued in this note. A reading of Boethius' *De consolazione philosophiae* II, m. 8 shows only the most general of similarities—an emphasis on the

power of love to bind together the warring elements of the cosmos. It is possible that Boccaccio used Boethius, especially for stanza 79, but much stronger is the argument for Lucretius, who agrees more closely with the sequence of his thought and his poetic form. Nothing written here, however, necessarily eliminates Boethius.

As far as I have been able to determine, the Boccaccio passage does not appear in the earlier treatments of the Troilus story—Benoît of Sainte Maure's *Roman de Troie* and Guido delle Colonne's *Historia Troiana*. It is of course possible that a lost romance on the two Trojan lovers containing the invocation was known to Boccaccio—possibly even of Byzantine origin. If there was a lost Latin or Western version, it may have contained the appeal to Venus; if Byzantine, it is almost certain that the Lucretian invocation would be missing. Byzantium never recognized and probably never knew of Lucretius. Until further discoveries come to light, if ever, we must assume Boccaccio knew Lucretius, directly or indirectly, in the West, and most certainly in Italy.

Acceptance of Lucretius as a source in one way or another of the *Filostrato* necessarily involves a belief that there was at least one manuscript of *De rerum natura* (or part of it) circulating or at least present in Italy, probably in Naples or the south (where Boccaccio wrote his romance), before 1338. Lucretius was certainly not used by the makers of florilegia; hence we are forced to assume somewhere a manuscript of the text (or part of it). But it is equally clear, in view of Poggio's own comments on his discovery, that the manuscript was not known to the indefatigable humanist or his circle. Much can happen to a codex, and it may well have been destroyed, lost, or have found an unpublicized quiet resting place before ever becoming known to the Italian Renaissance scholars of the fifteenth century.

Inasmuch as the keystone of this argument—that Boccaccio used Lucretius—cannot be proved absolutely, we cannot apodictically state that the traditional

view of the Lucretian manuscript history is wrong. However what has been urged here will, I believe, show that the possibility of another archetype for the Italian manuscripts must be entertained. Other-

wise we face an insoluble problem in explaining *Filostrato* III, 74-79.

MORTON W. BLOOMFIELD

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

NOTES

1. On the date, see Vincenzo Crescini, *Contributo agli Studi sul Boccaccio* (1887), pp. 197ff.; Karl Young, *The Origin and Development of the Story of Troilus and Criseyde* (The Chaucer Society, Second Series 40, London 1908), pp. 29ff.; Henri Hauvette, *Boccaccio* (1914), pp. 74ff.; Vincenzo Fiesolano, *Giovanni Boccaccio, il Filostrato e il Ninfale Fiesolano* (Scrittori d'Italia, No. 165 [1937]), pp. 372-73.

2. Ll. 1-49. Albert S. Cook, "Chaucer, *Troilus and*

Criseyde 3. 1-38," *Archiv f. d. Studium d. neueren Sprachen* 119 (1907), 40-54.

3. 12. 16 and 9. 25 (Cook, *op. cit.*, p. 44).

4. Ed. Pernicone, pp. 89-91.

5. *Troilus*' paeon after III, 79 narrows down to a consideration of his own love for Cressida and finds no parallel at all in Lucretius.

6. See Cook, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

LUMINA MORTE RESIGNAT: A NOTE ON AENEID 4. 244

Virgil's account of the functions in which Mercury employed his wand¹ may be best understood if we regard it as a pattern of contrasts: (a) calling souls out of Orcus—despatching them to Tartarus; (b) bringing on sleep—taking it away; and then (c) the mystifying phrase relating to death and the eyes. What are we to make of the last? The explanation "unseals the eyes (in the spirit-world) after, or, in a state of, death" (see n. 1.) makes Mercury crudely trespass on a relative's duties, or, at least, ape them in the underworld in a manner unheard of elsewhere. Further, *morte* = "after death" is weak,² and "in a state of death" is not much better.

Taking *morte*, then, as strictly temporal ablative = "at the precise moment of death," we have a pointer to a tolerable meaning. What, precisely, can be sealed or closed by the god at the point of death? Nothing, really—even if we allow the unique interpretation of *resignare*; the eyes are closed at death, naturally, or after death by a relative, and not by Mercury as *Ψυχοπομπός* or otherwise! Is it the *pupillae*³ which are smashed like seals on a document when it is opened?

This is attractive, but recondite; and, while *resignare* never seems to mean "break" (a seal), but "break the seal of" (a document), it could fairly mean here to "break up the *pupillae* of the eyes"—*lumina* being the object. But there is a simpler meaning, with *resignare* = "open up". Can Mercury not restore to life a man who is on the borderline between life and death, but has not yet passed over? This is very like the explanation of Wagner, who first took *morte* = "from death," but later made it temporal ablative, while failing to see that his explanation missed the crisp interpretation which this ought to have given, if he had avoided the implication in his note that death had already taken place.⁴ Finally, this completes the pattern of contrasts with an internally contrasting phrase: (a) from the underworld—to the underworld; (b) into sleep—out of sleep; (c) to the very point of death and then back to life when the dividing line had *just been reached and no more*.

R. J. M. LINDSAY

BELFAST HIGH SCHOOL
NORTHERN IRELAND

NOTES

1. *Aen.* 4. 242-44, "hac animas ille euocat Orco, Pallentis alias sub Tartara tristia mittit, Dat somnos admittit et lumina morte resignat." The passage is apparently imitated by Statius *Theb.* 1. 306ff., though this throws no light on the crucial last two words, which have been interpreted in many ways. For a copious and scholarly documentation of past work on this passage

see Pease's commentary on *Aen.* 4 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1935), which, though brilliantly lucid, scarcely adds much that is new. Pease favors the same interpretation as Conington, Turnebus and Henry (who later suggested *morte* = "deep sleep," cf. his *Aeneidea*, ad loc. [Dublin, 1878]), recalling the practice of relatives who, having closed the eyes of a corpse at

death, opened them before cremation, and attributing a parallel function to Mercury in the underworld, namely opening the soul's eyes. Other explanations are "relax," "dissolve" (Heyne); Forb. remarks that the word cannot have this meaning; *re-* = "again" or "duly"—which again lacks evidence elsewhere, although we cannot rule out the possibility of a unique use of the word thus here, for effect, by a sort of erudite waywardness on Virgil's part; or the reader may have been intended to think of an unusual "meaning" first and only then to realize that the accepted one was actually intended. It is hardly likely that the unquestionable vagueness of his words can have been unintended by Virgil. Other suggested meanings will be mentioned later.

2. Mackail's ed. understands *morte* thus; our first instinct would be to take the word, in this unemphatic position, as a temporal ablative—"at the point of death" (cf. *Aen.* 4. 502, where it occupies the same position in the verse, apparently meaning "on the occasion of the death...," and, only by implication, "after the death..."). Forbiger (4th ed.) *ad Aen.* 4. 244 does not make a convincing case that *morte* gives just the same meaning as *in morte*. On *Aen.* 4. 502 he quotes *Aen.* 6. 371, 444 which are not parallel to it: in both passages *in morte* is used = "in a state of death." Forb. also refers to *Aen.* 4. 436,

where *morte* occupies the same position in the verse as 4. 244, but it is far from an undoubted circumstantial or temporal abl. of any kind in the former passage.

3. Serv. *ap.* Pease *ad loc.* "claudit, perturbat. est et aliud quod physici dicunt, pupillas, quas in oculis uideamus, morituros ante triduum non habere; quibus non uisus est summa desperatio. hoc ergo dicit 'resignat', hoc est, aufert signa luminibus." The Schol. Dan. adds "id est, signorum quibus quaeque noscantur intellectum tollit." Presumably the *pupillae*, the images in the eye visible to the outsider, were thought of as identical with the images seen by the eye in question.

4. Wagner (*ap.* Forbiger [4th ed.] *ad loc.*) at first made the assumption that *morte* without preposition could = a *morte*, which Forbiger denies; Wagner gave as the meaning "resignat a morte, s. resignat, ne claudantur, i. e., lumina aperit iam iam se claudentia, in uitam reuocat iam morientes, ut infra v. 375.... & V. 476": but he seems to imply that death is not yet reached—hence a seal is broken which has not yet been affixed to the eyes! In his later interpretation, with *morte* quite correctly taken as temporal abl., he spoils matters by his clumsy note "aperit oculos *morte clausos*, s. reuocat *mortuos* in uitam" making *morte* anything but a temporal ablative in the precise sense.

A NOTE ON AGAMEMNON 1656

It is necessary for my argument to quote the immediate context—I give Professor G. Thomson's text and arrangement—and such *apparatus* as is relevant:
Λο. εἰα δὴ, ξίφος πρόκωπον πᾶς τις εὐτρεπίζε-
τω.

Χο. ἀλλὰ καὶ γὰρ μὴν πρόχειρος οὐκ ἀνάινωμαι
θανεῖν.

Αι. δεχομένοις λέγεις θανεῖν σὺ τὴν τύχην δ'
αἰρούμεθα.

Κλ. μηδαμῶς, ὦ φίλατ' ἀνδρῶν, ἄλλα δράσω-
μεν κακά·

ἀλλὰ καὶ τάδ' ἐξαμῆσαι πολλὰ δύστηνον
θέρω·

πημονῆς δ' ἄλις γ' ὑπάρχει μηδὲν ἡματώ-
μενοις.

στείχεται, αἰδοῖτο γέροντες, πρὸς δόμους
πεπρωμένοις

πρὶν παθεῖν εἰζαντες ὄρα.

1651 centurioni trib. Thomson. 1656 πη-
μονῆς δ' ἄλις γ' ὑπάρχει μηδὲν ἡματώμεθα
codd. ὑπαρχε μηδὲν ἡματώμεθα dist. Wilamo-
witz, Mazon. ὑπάρχει Verrall. ὑπάρχει Scaliger.
μηδὲν αἰματώμεθα Jacob. μηδὲν ἡματωμένοις
Hermann.

ὑπαρχε has been taken to be a verb, either imperative, or, as emended, indicative. Both interpretations involve difficulty. The ὑπαρχε μηδὲν of Wila-

mowitz and Mazon is meaningless. Verrall understood his πημονῆς δ' ἄλις γ' ὑπάρχει literally to mean "As to punishment, make beginning of it at all events to a sufficient extent," and translated "Begin pain with enough"—which is hardly comprehensible.

Editors have generally preferred Scaliger's ὑπάρχει, meaning "is." Now ἄλις occurs fifty-one times in the tragedians, Aristophanes, and Plato. Examining these instances, and excluding the line under discussion, we find that where ἄλις is used with the genitive, accompanied by a prohibition, ellipse of the verb "to be" always occurs. (The instances are quoted below.) This evidence throws doubt on the need for the verb "to be" here, and more especially for a substitute ὑπάρχει.

There is another possible interpretation of the manuscript reading which seems previously not to have been considered. ὑπαρχε may be a substantive. The word is twice used elsewhere in tragedy:

1. Soph. *Aj.* 1105-6: ὑπαρχος ἄλλων δεῦρ' ἐπλευσας, οὐχ ὄλων στρατηγός
2. Eur. *Hel.* 1431-32: ἴτω δέ τις φράσαν ὑπάρχους τοῖς ἐμοῖς φέρειν κτλ.

Thus preserving *ὑπαρχε* and accepting Jacob's *μηδὲν αἰματώμεθα*, it would be possible to read line 1656 thus: *πημονῆς δ' ἄλις γ', ὑπαρχε· μηδὲν αἰματώμεθα*. The thought and construction are closely paralleled in Euripides *Hecuba* 278: *μηδὲ κτάνητε· τῶν τεθνηκότων ἄλις*. The other instances of *ἄλις* with genitive accompanied by prohibition are as follows:

1. Eur. *Rh.* 870: *μή θνησχ'· ἄλις γὰρ τῶν τεθνηκότων ὄχλος*.
 2. Eur. *Hec.* 394-95: *ἄλις κόρης σῆς θάνατος· οὐ προσοιστέος ἄλλος πρὸς ἄλλον*.
 3. Eur. *Ph.* 1234-35: *βίοτον μή λιπόντες ἐνθάδε, Σπαρτῶν τε λαὸς ἄλις ὅσος κεῖται νεκρός*.
 4. Eur. *Hel.* 1098-99: *μή μ' ἐξεργάσῃ· ἄλις δὲ λύμης ἦν μ' ἐλυμήνω πάρος*.
- Cf. Eur. *Alc.* 676; *Ion* 1508; *HF* 1394; *Soph. Phil.* 890-92.

My suggestion justifies *δ' ... γ'*. Otherwise, as Professor Fraenkel points out in his edition, it is doubtful whether these particles can be kept as they stand.

Who is the *ὑπαρχος*? Verrall argued that not two parties, but three, were involved in dispute here: Aegisthus, the Elders of the Chorus, and the Guards of Aegisthus. He assigned 1650 and 1653 to the *λοχαγός*. Headlam on 1650 pointed out that Aegisthus was "attended by *λοχίται* or *δορυφόροι*," but gave 1651 to the Chorus. Professor Thomson supports Verrall's argument, but assigns 1651 to the *λοχαγός*, "who gives the word of command in accordance with the tyrant's instructions."

The substantival interpretation also adds dramatic point to the scene. Clytemnestra intervenes at 1654 to save an awkward situation created by the bungling truculence of Aegisthus. She addresses first her lover, then his subordinate, then the Elders, and neutralizes all three parties in turn.

R. F. WILLETTTS

BIRMINGHAM, ENGLAND

A POINT OF KOINE GREEK LEXICOGRAPHY

The dictionaries of Koine and later Greek have been subject to various deficiencies and major or minor errors, among them many resulting from adherence to classical Greek patterns or meanings.

One major error of lexical presentation, still persisting even in the fourth and latest edition of D. Walter Bauer's excellent *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur* (Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1949 ff.)¹, is simply following a practice common and correct in the lexica of Homeric Greek, but entirely unsound and absurd for the Koine and New Testament Greek.

As is known, contraction of vowels was complete in the early Attic period and, since New Testament Greek is the Koine language developed from the Attic Koine, all such forms are contract throughout in the New Testament, so *μνᾶ* (not *μνάα*),

ἀπλοῦς (not *ἀπλόος*), *διπλοῦς*, *νοῦς*, *χνοῦς*, *ἡμεῖς* (*ἡμέεες*), *ἀδεῶς*, *ἀθηῶς*, *ἀληθῶς* (not *-έως*), etc. But, because the lexica of Homeric Greek, of ancient Greek dialects, and of classical Greek give the contract verbs in *-άω*, *-έω*, *-όω* as entries, so too did the compilers of New Testament Greek lexica, though the only form existing in the Koine was *-ῶ*. Thus *ἀγαθοεργέω* (and even *ἀγαθουργέω* with *-ου-* contracted in the interior but non-contract *-έω* in the termination), *ἀγαθοποιέω*, *αἰδέομαι*, *ἀγαλιέω* (and *-άομαι*), *ἀγαπάω* ("seit Homer"; correctly as far as the word is concerned, but the termination *-άω* certainly not in both Homer and NT; *-ῶ* in NT), *αἰτιάομαι*, *ἐγκαυχάομαι*, *ἀγριέω*, *ἀκριβέω*, *διαβεβαίδομαι*, *ἐγκομβόδομαι*, etc., etc. (running to hundreds).

The *-άω*, *-έω*, *-όω* first singular forms are, for the Koine, monstrous and how much so would be apparent if one would use as entries the pertinent infinitives of

the same as entries, i.e., ἀγαλλιάεν, ἀγρίοεν, ἀγωνιάεν, αἰρέεν or ἀγαλλιάεν, ἀγρίοεν etc. or *ἀεεν, -έεεν, -όεεν (or -άειν, -έειν, -όειν, in which -ειν means -ῆν).² But the infinitives are conversely given in the contract form and so also by Albert Debrunner in his New Testament grammar: ἀδικεῖν (thereunder ἀδικῶ, Index), ἀλνεῖν, αἰρεῖν, αἰτεῖν (ἀπαιτεῖν), ἀξιοῦν, ἀπαλλοτριοῦν, ἀπαντᾶν, ζῆν, etc.

If one is not permitted to stamp New Testament Greek as Modern Greek, even less is he permitted to speak of New Testament forms as surviving unchanged "seit Homer" (and Bauer himself certainly does not think so). Homeric Greek or ancient dialectal Greek, on the one hand, and Koine Greek, on the other, cannot be taken indiscriminately as one unified language. Between Homeric and Koine there is the period of Attic Greek from which Koine Greek derives; and the latter differs from Homeric much more than modern Greek does from pre-Christian Koine.

It is a sound linguistic principle that a grammar or a lexicon of any language deals with its structure and the forms in actual use in the period concerned, not with older or reconstructed forms. For a French word like *aimer* no lexicographer of our time would think of setting up the entry *amare*; no one would treat English *say* under Middle English *sayn* or *sayen*, *siggen*, *seggen*, and much less under Anglo-Saxon *secgan* (Old Norse *segja*); by the same analogy ἀγαπῶ is the actual NT form and only this may be set as the entry, not ἀγαπάω. The contraction of -άω to -ῶ had taken place in Attic centuries before Koine (and NT) Greek. It is, therefore, a matter not for the NT lexicon but one for historical grammar to discuss the descent of Attic ἀγαπῶ from earlier ἀγαπάω.

Furthermore there are among the verbs some which are pure and simple Koine verbs formed first in Hellenistic times on the analogical basis of other, already contracted, verbs, e.g., ἀροτριῶ, δειλιῶ, λιμῶ, etc.; ἀθεῶ, ἀκατασταῶ, [ἀκρηδεμονῶ], ἀστοχῶ, ἐγκακῶ, ἐλλογῶ, etc.; ἀνασταῶ (-οῖς), ἀπλῶ, ἀφυπνῶ, ἀχρεῖῶ, βεβηλῶ, δυναμῶ, ἐνῶ, κραταιῶ, καυσῶ, μορφῶ

(μεταμορφῶ), νεκρῶ, σαρῶ (class. σαίρω), σπιλῶ, χαριτῶ (-οῖς).³ These also are given in entries in -άω, -έω, -όω, that is, they are granted a form which they never had in any period of the history of the Greek language. A similar practice appears to be the restoration of -γ- in the entry ἀναγι(γ)νώσκω for the sole Koine Greek form ἀναγινώσκω (although only διαγινώσκω, etc. is given). Furthermore instead of ζῶ and ἀναζῶ one finds the non-contract entry [ζάω] and ἀναζάω, though we now know that the correct uncontracted form was only *ζῆω; likewise χρῶμαι is not from *χράομαι but from *χρήομαι.

Modern Greek, which developed from, and continues, the Koine, also has ἀγαπῶ, ἀγνῶ, etc., that is, it has preserved the Attic and Koine situation.

The onesided absurdity of the practice followed thus far in Koine⁴ and NT lexica with two exceptions known to me⁵ springs to the eye of the trained scholar when he, knowing that the forms existing in Koine were contracted, finds in these lexica side by side μνάομαι but μνᾶ, ἀπλώω (ἐξαπλώω) but ἀπλοῦς and ἀπλῶς, διπλώω but διπλοῦς, νοέω but νοῦς, etc. Further, contracted forms should be given only contracted to distinguish them from forms (from Ionic) which are really uncontracted, as ἐπασιδός, νομηνία. The *Greek-English Lexicon* of Liddell-Scott-Jones is more consistent in giving almost all entries uncontracted, so even ἀπλός, διπλός, νόος, etc. (but μνᾶ, ἀπλῶς, as befits these, the only existing forms). But it is no less urgent for a general lexicon like the *GEL* to give as entries the contract forms, if only these occur.

Of course, the real reason for the current practice in Koine and NT lexicography and elsewhere is that it serves to show briefly the class of a given contract verb, so ἀγαπάω belongs to the -άω class, ἀγνοέω to the -έω class, ἀξιώω to the -όω class, the contracted first singular form -ῶ representing earlier -άω, -έω, -όω; and knowledge of the class facilitates the understanding of the conjugated forms. However, this erroneous way of serving the scholar results in perpetuating as entries the non-existent pseudo-forms in -άω, -έω, -όω; and this is

indeed no help at all; consider, e. g., the 1st singular forms θέω "want," ζέω, θέω, πλέω, πνέω, ῥέω, χέω (which are always uncontracted and never occur as δῶ, ζῶ, θῶ, πλῶ, πνῶ, ῥῶ, χῶ); how are they distinguished in the lexicon from ἀδικέω, αἰνέω, etc. (which in fact occur only as ἀδικῶ, αἰνῶ, etc.)? The best way to facilitate scholarly work is to give in parentheses or in brackets immediately after the entry the second (or third) singular form, thus:

ἀγαπῶ [-ᾶς]

ἀγνοῶ [-εῖς]

ἀκούω [-οῖς]

ζῶ [-ζῆς]

And these have the advantage of being

actual forms. Or, give ἀγαπῶ (-α- type), ἀγνοῶ (-ε- type), etc.

After other prescientific practices have long since been overcome, an up-to-date dictionary cannot ignore progress in language study and modern lexicography. It must be said that the practice followed in Koine lexicography thus far is not the result of ignorance. It is a matter now of changing the existing bad practice. And it is time to improve the Koine dictionaries as well as a new NT dictionary in this respect.⁶

DEMETRIUS J. GEORGACAS

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

NOTES

1. Bauer, a thorough student of the Koine and Greek literature, certainly knows all differences of Koine Greek from classical Greek; in his second edition (1928), in his excellent introduction, p. xii he says, "Ein Vergleich offenbart vielmehr Unterschiede in Laut- und Formenlehre, in Syntax und Stil und nicht zum wenigsten auch im Sprachschatz." I am confident that Bauer would have abandoned the practice discussed below if his attention had been properly drawn to the problem.

2. On the correct reconstruction of the infinitives in -εν, -εεν see E. Schwyzler, *Griechische Grammatik*, I (Munich, 1939), 807²⁻⁴, 809².

3. Bauer lists these and other verbs in his lexicon¹, (1928) p. xv; so do also James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources* (London, 1930), s.v.; cf. *GEL* s.v. (and addenda et corrigenda).

4. See *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden* ..., bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Emil Kießling, IV. 1, ἀ-αῖρος (Berlin, 1944), *passim*; Edwin Mayer, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, I-II (1906-38); so also Moulton and Milligan, *op. cit.*;

A Concordance to the Greek Testament According to the Texts of Westcott and Hort Tischendorf and the English Revisers, edited by W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897).

5. All entries of contract words are given in their contract form in *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (including the Apocryphal Books)* by the late Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath assisted by other scholars, Vols. I-II (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1897); *Ταμείον τῶν τῆς Καινῆς Διαθήκης Λέξεων sive Concordantiae omnium vocum Novi Testamenti Graeci cura Caroli Hermannii Bruder, Editio stereotypa septima* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913).

6. I therefore highly recommend to the redactors of the new Greek-English Dictionary of the NT, Dr. William Arndt (Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri) and Dr. F. Wilbur Gingrich (Albright College, at present at the University of Chicago Press) that they seriously consider this important point and avoid the practice followed until now in New Testament lexicography. The same is valid of course for the *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden*. See note 4.

BOOK REVIEWS

Q. Horati Flacci opera. Edited by FRIEDRICH KLINGNER. 2d ed. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1950. Pp. xxii+4+378. \$3.75.

The first edition of this important work was published in the ill-fated year 1939. The confusion of war, the interruption of international communication, and the final destruction of the great Teubner Verlag must have limited very greatly the diffusion of that volume, so that to great numbers of Horatian readers and students this second edition will come as a new book. A few significant notices of it appeared in Europe in the following year, and in our own country it was mentioned briefly in the *American Journal of Philology* for 1940, and more thoroughly and judiciously by Professor Harold Joliffe in the *Classical Weekly* of the same year. It has, however, so far as I can discern, played little role in the Horatian studies of the intervening time.

The essential significance of the book lies in a new and ambitious reassessment of the text tradition. Klingner has not, however, undertaken to examine *de novo* the vast manuscript sources. With generous and prudent recognition he accepts the Herculean labors of Keller and Holder as sound, and with only the addition of two manuscripts not employed, or fully employed, by them he builds upon their foundation. This statement does less than justice to the independence and originality of his work, and of his conclusions, whether or not one is prepared to accept them. On the face of it we seem to have once more the familiar three classes of Keller and Holder, but with an essential difference of conception. The two primary sources of the tradition he designates as Ξ , and Υ (the Greek letters representing two archetypes of ancient descent), while Q represents a medieval conflation of them of earlier date than any of the ex-

tant manuscripts, but not reaching back to an independent ancient source. Its position is intermediate between the two primary sources, and it corresponds in general to Keller's Class I. It contains several of the purest sources of the Horatian text. Its justification as a separate class depends less upon the readings of the text than upon the conflation of two types of introductory titles. They show in Q a merging of the titles which appear separately in the two ancient archetypes. This distinction and its importance, to be understood clearly, require a perusal of Klingner's two preliminary papers in *Hermes*, LXX (1935). Concerning the general problem of classification of Horatian manuscripts there is place for considerable scepticism. While the total number of extant copies is large, yet the essential early copies are few, and within them there is a vast amount of crossing of one manuscript by another where the defect of the original was supplied by another of unrelated type, of corrections by erasure, by deletions, glosses, etc. Then furthermore there is an unknown quantity, in manuscripts which once contributed to the tradition but are now lost, which may well frustrate any attempt at a true estimate of relations—such an example as confronts us in the meager and uncertain readings of the oldest Blandinian, which play havoc with all the theories that have hitherto been advanced.

It is with the assumption of a third or intermediary class that most critics will, I believe, quarrel, holding that the criterion referred to above, for establishing a separate class, is quite inadequate. The constituent elements of Q , so far as text readings are concerned, are of equal value with Ξ , which in practice, for the most part, it reinforces. As a separate class it is seldom invoked, and rarely is called upon

to support *Y*. Without it the critical apparatus, already overburdened, might have been simplified, and in fact as it stands this division overloads the page, and in the absence of a table of abbreviations is not infrequently obscure. We are to be sure dealing with an edition which pretends to answer every question pertaining to the text, and it is doubtless churlish to complain of its minutiae. It is not a Horace for the literary reader, nor even for the wayfaring scholar, but (in Housman's malignant phrase) one might characterize it as "editorum in usum," or descending a little, for the uses of the graduate seminar and training in text criticism. But the volume demands a place in every Horatian library, more especially since the volumes of Keller and Holder have become rare and difficult of access. Let me add however that the new Horace does not entirely supersede them. They will frequently furnish a welcome key to Klingner's cryptic brevity, and their descriptions of the manuscripts, and their record of sources not used by Klingner will remain of lasting value.

For a critical edition concerned primarily with the available sources of the poet's words, the actual text presented by an editor is paradoxically not the main thing — unless one might expect that the accompanying text should dispense as nearly as possible with every subjective element of conjecture, deletion, and opinions of authenticity, presenting merely the text emerging from the principles of choice followed by the editor. That indeed is almost what Keller and Holder accomplished, permitting themselves, either from choice or prejudice (as in the *Blandinians*), very little subjective decision, and registering faithfully the results of their principles of classification. Their text would have been more interesting if they had been quite consistent. Klingner aims at no such goal. He has indulged in a considerable degree of subjectivity by admitting conjecture, marks of deletion, of assumed interpolation, and one or two cases of transposition. His text seems to

correspond on the whole more closely to Heinze's final reworking of Kiessling than to any other. There is no space to discuss the merits of such changes from the text as handed down. Some changes are of course necessary, but on the whole I prefer the moderation of Wickham-Garrod. But Klingner is not extreme, and his choice in no way prejudices judgment of his edition as a whole. It is the work of a scholar of much distinction, who has made valuable contributions to the literary and historical interpretation of our poet. His several papers published in *Die Antike* during the '30's upon different aspects of Horace's life and art are among the best contributions to the revived interest which the Horatian anniversary of '35 evoked.

G. L. HENDRICKSON

Yale University

The Roman Stage: A Short History of Latin Drama in the Time of the Republic. By W. BEARE. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1950. Pp. xii + 292 + 8 pls. + 8 ills. in text. 25 s.

The numerous books and articles which have been written about the comedies of Plautus and Terence during the past half century have all too often been directed toward an ingenious but frequently futile attempt to reconstruct the lost Greek comedies from which the Roman plays were adapted. A book devoted to Roman drama which does not attempt such reconstructions is therefore most welcome, and Professor Beare has done an invaluable service in writing "a connected account of the drama produced in the theatres of ancient Rome" (p. 1). The book is far more than a history of the ancient dramatic forms, both tragic and comic, for, as the main title indicates, it deals also with the nature of the Roman theater and the manner in which the plays were presented.

Much of the book will not be new to the classical scholar, for Professor Beare, long a distinguished authority on Roman

drama, has published during the past twenty years in *Hermathena*, *Classical Quarterly*, *Classical Review*, and elsewhere numerous articles on many of the topics treated in the volume under review. Several of these articles are reprinted without change as appendices,¹ and the substance of many other articles has been incorporated into the text, e.g., on Terence's originality and the nature of *contaminatio* (pp. 89ff.). For the classical student and the general reader the book as a whole presents a complete and coherent account of the development of Roman drama from its pre-literary beginnings to the rise of the mime at the end of the Republic. The final chapter (pp. 225-32) provides in an epilogue a brief sketch of the drama of the Empire, including a discussion of Seneca, whose plays Beare believes were "meant to be read or declaimed, not to be acted" (p. 227).

It should be pointed out that many of Professor Beare's theories are not found in the standard handbooks of Roman literature; he has little confidence in many ancient authorities and does not hesitate to reject their statement; he doubts, e.g., that Livius Andronicus was taken prisoner by the Romans at the capture of Tarentum (pp. 16f.), and he is especially skeptical about the ancient statements concerning Terence's life, e.g., that Terence was born in Carthage, was brought to Rome as a slave, and died in Greece (pp. 83f.). He believes that Terence was an original artist who posed as a translator (p. 97) and who attempted to deceive his audience by pretending that his procedure (to which his adversaries had applied the verb *contaminare*) was similar to that of the earlier dramatists (pp. 90ff.). I have discussed many of these theories elsewhere² and shall therefore comment briefly upon only a few points: (1) Beare's view (pp. 248ff.) that the *angiportum* is not an "alley" providing a means of exit from the stage seems sound and is the view of Professor

Harsh and other scholars; (2) that actors in the days of Plautus and Terence wore masks (pp. 178f., 184ff.) also seems likely. On the other hand, I do not agree (3) that the common view of Dossennus as cunning should be rejected (pp. 131f.), (4) that Terence should be included among the worthless new poets mentioned in Plautus *Cas.* 9f. (p. 75), (5) that the *Mercator* differs strikingly from the other comedies of Plautus and perhaps is by a different hand (pp. 37, 39, 57; cf. pp. 134, 155), or (6) that "there is no song in Plautus" (p. 224). Beare's evidence for this last statement does not seem conclusive; even if the ancients did not make the same distinction between "speech" and "song" that is made today (pp. 215ff.), the numerous Plautine passages in lyrical measures afforded opportunities for song and dance that would hardly have been ignored in every instance, and the word "song" seems the best term to distinguish such passages from the ordinary *cantica* composed in long iambic and trochaic meters.

Professor Beare's theories are always suggestive and stimulating and his book deserves careful reading by all who are interested in ancient drama. The space devoted to Plautus (pp. 35-39, 46-59) and to Terence (pp. 81-104) seems relatively small, but this is inevitable in a work which deals with all the various dramatic forms (*togata*, *praetexta*, *Atellana*, mime, etc.). Also, for the problems of staging, much material is drawn from the plays themselves, which Beare rightly considers "the primary source of evidence which is certainly valid and relevant" (p. viii). The carefully chosen illustrations depicting both ancient theaters and scenes from ancient comedies add to the attractiveness of the book.

GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH

Princeton University

2. In a new book, *The Nature of Roman Comedy*, published in February, 1952, by the Princeton University Press. This work is concerned primarily with the comedies themselves, but the preliminary chapters cover much the same area that is treated by Beare.

1. Cf. Appendices A through E (pp. 233-66). Chapter XXV (pp. 188-210) on "The Roman Origin of the Law of Five Acts" reproduces with modifications the article in *Herm.*, LXXII (1948), 44-70.

Latin Literature. By W. A. LAIDLAW. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. Pp. 229. \$2.75.

This concise account of Latin literature, published in England in Methuen's "Home Study Books" series, is addressed to the nontechnical reader who wishes to survey ancient Latin writing in its main outlines. The author discusses the various *genres* in fifteen chapters, beginning with essays on comedy, tragedy, and epic poetry through Virgil, and concluding with a chapter on didactic and technical prose and one on the novel. This is an improvement over the conventional chronological arrangement, and should make it relatively easy for the uninitiated to form a coherent notion of the nature and scope of Roman letters.

The treatment, by and large, is perspicacious and without stiffness, with the result that the impression is given that Latin literature is alive and spirited, and well worth looking into further. This feeling is strengthened by abundant quotations from Latin writers, which have been selected with great good judgment, and furnished with attractive and precise translations, in the great majority of cases the work of the author.

The opening chapters on comedy and tragedy are lucid and to the point. Of Plautus' plays it is aptly observed "It is as though a French comedy staged in England had been permitted the licensed appendages of pantomime" (p. 14). Less satisfactory are the pages on epic poetry through Virgil; although the author tries hard to give Virgil his due, one can sense a certain reserve. Julius Caesar Scaliger would (perhaps) have smiled at the query, made apropos of Propertius' famous "*nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade*," "But could Virgil hope to equal, let alone rival, the *Iliad*?" (p. 49), whereas the observation (p. 51) "in the second half Turnus almost 'steals the picture,'" with its implication that Virgil lost control of his poem, is misleadingly superficial.

Cicero's achievement is adequately set

forth, with proper emphasis on his part in the development of prose style. The familiar statement about Cicero's philosophical eclecticism appears on page 68, although, as has recently been pointed out, he, unlike Seneca, was by no means eclectic with regard to Epicureanism, but rejected it entirely. The chapters on lyric and didactic verse contain sympathetic accounts of Lucretius and Catullus, and that on elegy a judicious appraisal of Ovid. Silver epic is examined without rancor, and Valerius Flaccus' virtues gratifyingly recognized. It may be exact that "Statius is by common consent a better epic poet than Silius" (p. 143), but upon how much direct knowledge does this consent rest? For all his extravagance, Silius can tell a story with color and effect, and he is not wholly indifferent to structural considerations. This cannot be said of Statius. Of the remaining chapters, those on satire and on history stand out, particularly the latter. The author's preference goes to Juvenal and Tacitus rather than to Livy and Horace, but that is his privilege, and it is not unfitting that a book designed for a wide public should stress the merits of writers whose appeal is general and immediate.

There are occasional loose statements and inaccuracies. One example concerns Naevius: "When he lampooned the great general Scipio, Rome became too hot for him, and he retired to Carthage, [*sic*] where he brooded on his experiences as a soldier and conceived the notion of writing an heroic poem on the war—*bellum Punicum*" (p. 36), and there are others.¹

1. P. 17: "*vis comica*": in the verses in question Caesar did not construe these words together. P. 61: Verres' office was not "Governor of Syracuse" but propraetor of Sicily. P. 63: Cicero's favorite clausula was not "of the pattern *esse videatur*." According to T. Zielinski, this pattern is found in 4.3% of the clausulae of Cicero's speeches, and is fifth in order of frequency (see the table following "Das Clauselgesetz in Ciceros Reden" (*Philologus*, Supplementband IX (1904), 589-844)). P. 123: "... the pentameter, which may end with a syllable of any length": for "syllable of any length" read "word of any number of syllables." P. 129: "But when Augustus was succeeded by Tiberius the poet abandoned hope": Augustus' death was, to be sure, a blow to Ovid, but he hopefully continued trying to influence members of the imperial family, as the new dedication of the first book

Naevius did include in one of his plays a disrespectful allusion to a youthful escapade of the Roman commander, but what made Rome too hot for him was his lampooning of the Metelli. In his entry for 201 B.C. St. Jerome writes "Naevius comicus Uticae moritur pulsus Roma factione nobilium ac praecipue Metelli." Neither the date nor the removal to Utica is certain; that the poet waited until this problematical exile (which could hardly be before the Roman invasion of Africa in 204) to conceive and compose his poem is unlikely to the last degree. A number of chronological slips have been noted, not all of which can be blamed on the printer,² and there are too many misprints in the Latin quotations and mistakes in the references.³ It is a pity that an intelligent and well-written book should be thus handicapped.

RICHARD T. BRUÈRE

University of Chicago

of the *Fasti* shows. P. 136: the "exaggeration and absurdity" charged against Lucan on the basis of BC 2. 181f. should properly be held against Ovid, for Lucan here appropriates *Met.* 6. 558-60 (Philomela's severed tongue). P. 142: it is misleading to quote Merivale's remark about Lucan's not having read Virgil; Lucan's familiarity with Virgil is common knowledge, and indeed is emphasized by the author on p. 133. P. 148: "Squints" as a translation of οἰλλοι is no longer accepted. P. 150: it is not clear why the fragment of Lucilius cited (Marx 1196-1208, Warmington 1326-38) is said "probably" to belong to the fourth book. Marx and Warmington place it among the unassigned fragments, and C. Cichorius (*Untersuchungen zu Lucilius* [Berlin, 1908], pp. 353-54) considers it impossible to determine from which book it comes. P. 205: we have sixteen books of letters from Cicero to Atticus, rather than twelve. P. 207: the elder Seneca was not, so far as is known, a "teacher of rhetoric." P. 210: Aulus Gellius flourished in the second rather than "in the middle of the first century A.D."

2. P. 1: "A decade after his [Ennius'] death came the final sharp struggle with Carthage": two decades. P. 4: Nero died A.D. 68, not 69. P. 71: Aratus' death took place in 240/39 (OCD) not 249 A.C. P. 141: Domitian became emperor in A.D. 81, not 80. P. 146: Claudian may have died in the year of his marriage, A.D. 404 (it has been surmised that he perished on his honeymoon), but he cannot very well have been born in A.D. 305, ninety-nine years before. P. 189: Pollio's history began with the consulship of Metellus Celer, thus with 60, not 61 B.C.

3. P. 23: the reference following the quotation from the *Tristia* should be II, 424, not I, 243. P. 24, I, 11: the reading should be *laqueotis*. P. 32: *loquantur* is misspelled in the line of Seneca's *Phaedra* quoted. P. 48: there is a "u" in the first line of the Virgil quotation

Samlade latinska originaldikter och översättningar till latinsk vers. By CHRISTIAN ALFRED FAHLERANTZ. Stockholm: Kungl. Boktryckeriet P. A. Norstedt & Söner, 1949. Pp. 180 + frontispiece. *Vox rivuli: Carmina.* By EMANUELE CASTORINA. Catania: Cav. Niccolò Giannotta, 1950. Pp. 63. L. 300. *Aprici flores: Carmina.* By EMILIO MERONE. With a Preface by F. SBORDONE. Neapoli: Apud Aloysium Loffredo Bibliopolam, 1950. Pp. 103. L. 350.

Christian Alfred Fahlerantz, who taught Latin poetry for most of the second half of the last century at the Upsala *gymnasium* was also a talented writer of Latin verse, as this collection edited by Professor Gabriel Sjögren, once his pupil, attests. The original poems which occupy the first pages of the book are occasional pieces, e. g., "In beatos manes Oscanis I," and despite smooth versification¹ and pleasant conceits have faded over the years; of greater present interest are many of the translations which make up the bulk of the volume.

There are two extensive versions from the Greek, one of the *Batrachomyomachia*, which reads as well as the original, and the other of the sixth book of the *Odyssey*, written thirty-two years later (1907), where the translator has been less success-

where a "v" is needed; the reverse is the case in the third line. P. 51: the familiar quotation is *tantae* (not *tantis*) *molis erat*, etc. P. 63: the distressing expression *numerosa oratorio* appears twice on this page. P. 76: the first reference to Lucretius should be II, 59ff. (not 55), the first on the next page III (not I), 18ff. P. 83: *atque* has disappeared from the middle of Verg. *Georg.* 2. 149. P. 102: the quotation is from Hor. *Carm.* I, 11 (not II), 7. P. 107: although one is grateful to the author for spelling "Virgil" in the traditional manner, "Appendix Virgiliana" is going too far. P. 121: the second figure in the reference to Propertius at the top of the page should be 11 rather than II. P. 135: Caesar's speech on the eve of Pharsalia is in Lucan's seventh, not eighth book. P. 150: the second word of Iuv. 1. 167 is *tacita*, not *tacitis*; the quotation from Horace which follows is from the second, not the first book of the *Satires*. P. 164: the second word of Iuv. 14. 48 is not *nefas* but *paras*. P. 169: the reference to Martial near the bottom of the page should be X, 62, 12, not "XII, 10"; the one at the top of the following page, VIII, 55, 5 (the 55 is missing).

1. Except for a false quantity on p. 16 pointed out by Professor Sjögren in a letter to CP, no metrical blemishes have been noted. There are misprints on pp. 120, 141, and 163, but they will cause readers no difficulty.

ful. Little of the peculiar quality of the Homeric verses has come over into the Latin lines, and there are some infelicities: "calido . . . quam corde colebat" hardly corresponds to *καλὸν δὲ θυμῷ* (23), nor is "sublimis" an ideal version of *ἐσθρονος* (48). On the other hand the neologism "plexicomus" for *ἐπὶ πλόκαμος* (135 and 198) is both clear and appropriate.

Extremely skillful are translations of Shakespeare's "As You Like It" II. 7 ("unum, crede mihi, tellus est tota theatrum"), Hamlet's soliloquy, and "The Tempest" IV. 1. 152 ff.: "The cloud-capp'd towers, the gorgeous palaces, etc." of which there are two versions, beginning "superba regum tecta, turres arduae" and "aëriae turres, regum sublimia tecta" respectively. Both are equally happy (pp. 43-46).

A considerable section of the book is taken up with a translation of the third and fourth acts of Schiller's "Die Braut von Messina" into Senecan meters (pp. 60-113). The reviewer found this section, notwithstanding the elegance of the Latinity and the impeccable rhythm, somewhat heavy going, although no more so than the original German. Finally there are a number of renditions of short lyrical or epigrammatic pieces by such Swedish poets as Tegnér, Stagnelius, and Bellman. These are done with delicacy and taste. Typical is the version of Bellman's "To Night" in two Alcaiac strophes, of which the following is the first:

Tandem venite, Nox bona; fervidas
flammas diei reprime; fac, polo
contentat ardori cadentis
purpureo tua stella solis (p. 124).

In the twenty-seven poems of *Vox rivuli*, Professor Castorina has employed no less than twenty meters. This Paganini-like display of virtuosity should not blind one to the considerable merit of many of the poems. "Occasus" (p. 20), for instance, lacks neither vividness nor emotion, while "Ad fratrem" (p. 54), commemorating the poet's close escape from disaster while riding in his brother's automobile, con-

vinces up the hair-raising *insouciance* of meridional European driving with graphic humor. The author avoids *flosculi*, and is not unduly constrained by classical precedent in diction or vocabulary. This, within limits, is a good thing: to object to the sun's licking Delia's wan face ("lambabat," p. 20) on the ground that there is no exact parallel for the expression in ancient Latin verse is to look upon Latin as a dead language. In Professor Castorina's ingratiating collection it is anything but that.²

Aprici flores, the third volume of Latin verse the author has published,³ comprises seventy-one pieces, for the most part quite brief, which portray the bright days and starlit nights of Naples, its bay, and nearby islands with a grace and vividness which neither Statius nor Sannazaro has surpassed. Among the most striking poems of a collection of uniformly high quality are "Portus Neapolitanus" (p. 42), "Caprearum specus caeruleus" (p. 80), and "Vesuvius candidus" (p. 93). The four lines of "Ardor meridianus in urbe" (p. 54) admirably convey the stifling emptiness of a Neapolitan street in the heat of a summer's noon:

Hac hora nimio calore fervet
bitumen nitidum viae silentis.
Rarus conspicitur viator ire:
alveo fluvii lacerta sicco.

No less evocative are the closing verses of the nocturne "Caeli aratum" (p. 33):

velivolum subito rumpit laceratque
tacentem
noctem quod caeli mihi paene videtur
aratum
sulcans, more suo, caelestia pabula
pulchra.

Neologisms such as "velivolum" (Ital. *velivolo*, "aircraft") are rare: cf. "peralmo" (p. 50); there are a few unusual words,

2. Occasionally somewhat opaque expressions are employed, e. g., "genus revolvens" (p. 16) of a girl taking a seat on a wall, or "maximus artis/excubitus" (p. 40) with reference to Attica. In the Asclepiad "ipsae Nereides, oscula, leniter" (p. 18) the final syllable of "Nereides" is short (cf. Cat. 64. 15), whereas a long one is required.

3. *Helenor-Nugae* (Naples, 1942) and *Carmina* (Naples, 1947).

such as the ἀπ. λεγ. "tardigradus" (p. 27), or late ones, e. g., "silenter" (p. 69), and on p. 52 the unabashed tmesis "et amphialta theatra" is found, but for the most part the author takes the traditional vocabulary of ancient Latin poetry and employs it with imagination and resource to produce verse of remarkable freshness and charm.

RICHARD T. BRUÈRE

University of Chicago

Index verborum Iuvenalis. By LUCILE KELLING and ALBERT SUSKIN. Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1951. Pp. vii + 139. \$5.00.

Mechanical accuracy is the first virtue of an *Index verborum*, and this the compilers of the present work have attained to an uncommonly high degree. The only errors of this nature, except for several mentioned below, which the reviewer has detected are the following: p. 3, s. v. *acer*: the reference accompanying *acribus* (*neu. ab.*) should be XIV, 322 (not 62); p. 22: for the heading *Chios*, *Chione* should be substituted; p. 37: "Dorida (*ac.*) III, 94" should be lowered a line so that it follows the subhead *Doris*; p. 54: it should be specified that *Hermae* (VIII, 53) is dative; p. 57: the first two entries s. v. *Ilium* should be placed under a subhead *Ilias*; p. 136: for the heading *victum* read *victus*; p. 139: the accent of ἐφέλω has dropped out.

The authors quote the late Professor W. A. Oldfather's precept "the variants and even corruptions in the manuscripts should be made as readily available to scholars as are the judgments upon the text," and state, again in Professor Oldfather's words, that the *Index* is a critical one in that it proposes "to report the entire body of critical material upon which the texts followed [N. Vianello (1935); S. G. Owen² (1908); the 1938 corrected reprint of A. E. Housman's edition of 1905; O. J. Jahn,⁴ as revised by F. Buech-

eler and F. Leo (1910)] are constituted, making record of the authenticity of all entries." This leads upon occasion to including matter of questionable utility. For instance *Saufeia* (6. 320) (this spelling, which stands in Housman's text, has been overlooked by the compilers) appears in Housman's *apparatus* as *saufeia*, (*posita*) *saut feta*, *aut feta*, *aufega*, *laufeia*, *laufela*, *laufella*, and *lanfella*, and all these are listed. Once a mess of this sort has been cleared up, there seems little point in burdening an *Index* with its constituent elements. Even so we have not the entire story: upon consulting the *apparatus* of U. Knoche's 1950 edition, which appeared far too late to be used in the *Index*, we find the additional forms *laufega*, *laufera*, and *laufena*, and doubtless many more variations exist in the manuscripts. Inclusion of variant readings and significant corruptions enhances the value of an *Index*, and the authors do well not to restrict themselves to the accepted texts, but "the entire body of critical material" (constantly increasing in bulk as more manuscripts are examined) upon which the text of a writer of complex manuscript tradition should be based in a modern *editio maior* belongs in a critical *apparatus* rather than in an *Index verborum*.

Harper's Latin Dictionary has been used as guide in determining the headings. If a word is not found in *Harper's* "only the form as it appears in Juvenal, with case noted, is listed" (p. vi). For example *Modia* (3. 130), who is not in *Harper's*, appears without heading as *Modiam* (but *Albina*, whose name occurs in the same case in the same line and is also missing from *Harper's*, is dignified by having her name in the nominative as heading). Picayune inconsistencies of this sort will bother nobody; more disturbing is the treatment of proper names, which is almost always purely mechanical. Under the heading *Ajax* the first two entries refer to the Roman rhetorician of that name, the last two to the son of Telamon, but one has to look up the text to find this out; the two references s. v. *Antonius* do not con-

cern the same person; *s. v. Brutus* references to M. and to L. Brutus are lumped together; and *s. v. Caesar* it is not indicated whether Juvenal is speaking of Julius, Augustus, Domitian, or Hadrian (all of whom he thus designates at one time or another). Some attempt at classification does appear to have been made *s. v. Euryalus*, which is followed by a "2." In the preface (p. vi) it is stated that *Harper's* "has been used in numbering words that in the same form have different meanings (*e. g.*, *malum*)," but upon consulting *Harper's* one finds under *Euryalus* 2 both Nisus' companion and an obscure king of Thessaly, whereas Juvenal has in mind a gladiator of this name. Similar confusion is found *s. v. Fabius, Flora, Lentulus, Paris, Pompeius, Se-leucus*, and *Thebe*. On the other hand lower and upper case *sol* are listed separately.

These small defects do not prevent the *Index* from being an excellent one. Students of Juvenal will be grateful to the authors for the immense amount of meticulous labor they have expended to the advantage of all.

RICHARD T. BRUÈRE

University of Chicago

Untersuchungen zur Odyssee. By REINHOLD MERKELBACH. (*Zetemata*, Monographien zur klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, Heft 2.) München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1951. Pp. viii + 241. DM 18.50.

This is a splendid book. It is not intended for amusement, but for the use of those who are willing to work at the problem with which it deals—the composition of the *Odyssey*. In the twentieth century there have been four great treatments of that subject—those of Bethe, Schwartz, Wilamowitz, and Von der Mühl.¹ The present work is to be ranked,

I believe, as a fifth, and as one that makes important advances over its predecessors.

Where lies the progress?

Our *Odyssey* (B), written in Athens ca. 550 B.C., is an effort to combine in one poem all the stories about Odysseus, which B knew from a number of poems. Our goal must then be not the finding of an Ur-*odyssee*, but from one angle a reconstruction of B's sources as far as the material permits, and from another an understanding of his method of work. The problem is simplest in the first four books where B uses only two sources, a *Telemachy* (T) and a poem on Odysseus' Revenge (R). I choose this section as my starting point.

Thirty years ago Bethe showed that the Assembly (*Od.* 2. 1-259) is no part of the *Telemachy*, but comes from a poem (R) which was heading for the liquidation of the suitors. That view is basic, but our author was the first to appreciate it rightly. A corollary—but again seen only by our author—is that the suggestion to *Telemachus* (*Od.* 1. 267ff.) that he convene an assembly must also come from the same poem. We thus get something constructive to add to the devastating but well justified criticism of *Odyssey*, Book 1 made by Kirchhoff a lifetime ago. In the rest of *Odyssey*, Book 1 considerable fragments of R are now found, and our author would place here a reconstruction of the Plot to Assassinate *Telemachus*, which B has used in Books 4, 16, 20 with

Bechtel, Friedrich, *Die Vocalcontraction bei Homer*, Halle, 1908.

Bethe, Erich, *Homer II*, Leipzig, 1922 (2d ed., 1929).
Chantraine, Pierre, *Grammaire Homérique*, Paris, 1942.
Cobet, Carel Gabriel, *Miscellanea Critica*, Lugduni Batavorum, 1876.

Hartmann, Albert, *Untersuchungen über die Sagen vom Tod des Odysseus*, München, 1917.

Kayser, Karl Ludwig, *Homerische Abhandlung*, Leipzig, 1881.

Leumann, Manu, *Homerische Wörter*, Basel, 1950.

Mühl, Peter von der, "Odyssee," in Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, *Real-Encyclopädie der class. Altertumswissenschaft*, Supplementband VII, 696ff., Leipzig, 1940.

Schwartz, Eduard *Die Odyssee*, München, 1924.

Seeck, Otto, *Die Quellen der Odyssee*, Berlin, 1887.

Wackernagel, Jacob, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer*, Göttingen, 1916.

Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, Ulrich von, *Die Heimkehr des Odysseus*, Berlin, 1927.

1. The following works are cited by the author's name alone:

admixture of material of his own—a procedure very characteristic of his workmanship.

The analysis of the first four books seems then, thanks to our author, to be in excellent shape. We have recovered a good deal of the beginning of R. Some one—not necessarily Athene—has advised Telemachus to convoke an assembly to consider the behavior of the suitors. They learn of his intentions and plot his death. The assembly does nothing, but in its course Zeus sends an omen, and the seer interprets it to mean: Odysseus is already in Ithaca, planting slaughter and death for the suitors. We have been shown too the principal characters in action: Antinoos, Eurymachos, Amphinomos (the three suitors who are to die first), Telemachus, and Penelope.

The other source, the Telemachy, is seen to be a poem without the suitors, a thing that many have found hard to believe. B has altered this by supplying them chiefly at two points, but fortunately has left traces of his activity. He has also cut away the beginning of the poem and interrupts the story before reaching its end. The climax was to be what Proteus told about Odysseus; but obviously, whatever this was, it could not suit B's design; it would be either a repetition of the story told in Books 5–12, or a contradiction of it. Either way it would not do. Accordingly it has been cut: 13 lines for Locrian Aias, 36 for Agamemnon, and but 6 for Odysseus. Bethe believed that preference for Books 5–12 is the explanation of B's action. I agree rather with Merkelbach: what Proteus said was the sort of thing that would send Telemachus home happy, and was therefore unusable.

I turn now to the question of how the analysis fits in with the linguistic evidence. Before this it is necessary to consider the condition of the text. Between B, the text written ca. 550 B.C., and what I will call B*, the text we read in A.D. 1951, the difference is—to make a very rough guess—perhaps 700 lines, more or less. Had I attempted to count the number of

lines here termed—generally on grounds of intrinsic probability—interpolations, the result would probably not have been very different.

"Schwankungen im Zeilenbestand," says Von der Mühl (Col. 699), "kleinere Interpolationen berühren nur Nebensächliches." The author is probably in agreement with this, and I certainly am, as long as there is question only of literary analysis. There are passages in which I differ from Merkelbach as to what is B, and what is B*; but there is no passage in which his analysis depends upon getting the right answer to this question. At other levels the possibility of such error cannot be waved aside so easily. The *Odyssey* offers greater difficulty for the solution of such problems than does the *Iliad*. Partly because the manuscript, papyrus, and scholia material is less plentiful; but chiefly because the statements about atheteses in the scholia have not been systematically examined for the purpose of determining their trustworthiness.

Linguistic evidence also reveals less for the *Odyssey* than it does for the *Iliad*. In studying it I shall consider first not only *Odyssey*, Books 1–4, but also Books 13–24, within which B has another source A, a treatment, intended to rival R, of the events that followed Odysseus landing in Ithaca.

Wackernagel lists, sometimes with question marks, 34 passages that contain Atticisms not of the tradition but of the poets (p. 159). Of these 26 fall within the books named. From these some subtractions must be made. For Attic *ὄντες* 19. 230, *οὐσης* 19. 489, *ῥσι* 24. 491, Ionic *έόντες* etc. *cum synizesi* are read or suggested. Similarly *δενδρέων* 19. 520 can be explained either from Ionic *δένδρεον* *cum synizesi*, or from Attic *δένδρον* written in Ionic fashion. Apparently Attic is *έρέσθαι* in the phrase *μεταλλῆσαι καὶ έρέσθαι* 3.69, 243, 14. 378, 15. 405, 16. 465. In 1. 405 *περὶ ξείνοιο έρέσθαι* has been emended to *ξείνοι' έρέσθαι*, and similarly *έρέοιτο* not *έροιτο* is entitled to preference in 1. 135 = 3. 77. The emendations go back to Ahrens

and are approved by Wackernagel (pp. 120-22). I suggest ἐρέεσθαι > *ερείσθαι indistinguishable in the sixth century writing from ἐρέσθαι, and later sure to be supplanted by it. Such contraction is infrequent, but Bechtel cites from the *Odyssey* εἶρσε, κατεῖρυσται, 'Ρεῖθρον, χεῖσθαι (pp. 237-43). These nine forms then testify about the tradition, not about the poets. To them two others must be added. The ending -ησι in the subjunctive of the 1st aorist is not an Attic feature, but one of extremely late epic.² The examples are: ἀπαγγείλῃσι 4. 775, and ἐκπέμψῃσι 18.336. The interesting thing will be to see which poets use the fifteen Atticisms that remain.

To B may be assigned: ἀμόθεν (1. 10), τί παθόντες (24. 106), πόστον (24. 491). The distich

ὧς ἔφαθ'. οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ὁδᾶξ ἐν χεῖλεσι
φύντες

Τηλέμαχον θαύμαζον, ὃ θαρσαλέως ἀγόρευε

shows the association by "popular etymology" of ὁδᾶξ with ὁδόντ- found elsewhere only in Attic. Its occurrence in 20. 268-69 is given to B by the author (p. 108); as 18. 410-11 it belongs to B*, falling within an interpolation (405-11), recognized by Bethe (p. 95) and Schwartz (p. 328) and cited by Von der Mühl;³ as 1. 381-82 it belongs to B, following his handiwork in 373-80, with which it should have been included.

Telemachus' return home, 17. 31-166, is obviously an insertion made by B, and is so treated by Merkelbach (p. 74). In 17. 161 is ἐγεγώνευν, meaning not *clamare* but *φωνεῖν*. This has been shown by Wackernagel to be characteristically Attic (pp. 156-57). The athetesis of 17. 160-61 is accepted by Schwartz (p. 327), and may point to B*; but here there is no need to raise that question.

2. Cf. Wackernagel, p. 144; Chantraine, pp. 462-63. It is only Attic features that bear on the present question—not features of late epic on which Schwartz often makes interesting observations.

3. Such citations by Von der Mühl indicate a certain amount of approval. That Wilamowitz (p. 95) and the author (p. 81) think otherwise, seems regrettable.

The author assigns 18. 169-205 to B, and χρῶτα in 172, 179, confirms his verdict (pp. 12-13). Cobet regarded line 179 as an interpolation (p. 426f.), and Von der Mühl considered the opinion worth citing. Decision between B and B* seems to me unnecessary at this point.

Attic ἀεῖ is found in 15. 379. Schwartz describes the line well as a "verwässerte Ergänzung zu 378" (p. 324). I give the line to B*, and have no need to go into the problem of whether 15. 301-495 is by A (so Merkelbach, p. 67), or by B.

A correlation then between B (or B*) and the Atticisms is not perfect, but holds for two thirds (10 : 15) of the examples. It seems worthwhile to examine the residue and see whether its existence may not be due to some activity of B that the literary analysis could not detect.

Of 15. 222-25 our author is content to say that the situation comes from A, the wording belongs to B (p. 70). Attic θῦε in 222 confirms the second part of this opinion.

Of Book 20 Von der Mühl says, "qua forma libr. v habemus ab ult. poeta compositus est"; Wilamowitz is of a similar opinion (p. 86); Schwartz believes the problem here is to pick out of B fragments of earlier poetry (p. 111). Merkelbach is kinder (p. 102), but recognizes that because of εἰσιγέσκοντο 20. 7, and βεβῶσα 20. 14 some activity of B at this point is to be assumed.

The section 21. 175-87 is ascribed by our author to A (p. 117), and Wilamowitz is of a similar opinion (p. 56). Attic is ἐνεῖκε in 21. 178. The knot needs cutting, and I agree with Von der Mühl: "175-85 novati esse videntur."

In the Telemachy ἐρίοιο in 4. 124 is merely Attic ἐρίου epicized. The line must belong either to B or to B*. That *εἰρίοιο cannot enter dactylic verse is irrelevant; no man was under a compulsion to manufacture a verse in which it would be needed.

The evidence from Atticisms confirms then Merkelbach's analysis of this portion of the *Odyssey*.

The evidence adduced by Leumann is of a different type. It aims at showing that the author of a certain verse misunderstood another verse, and consequently is himself different from and later than its author. I cannot always follow his conclusions. He suggests (p. 244, n.) that ἐξ Ἰθάκης Ὑπονῆτου (3. 81) comes from a misinterpretation of ἐν λιμένι Πείθρῳ, ὅπῃ Νῆϊς ὤλθεν (1. 186), but does not include this suggestion in his summary (p. 331).

Merkelbach accepts this (p. 21, n. 1); but I cannot find evidence for interdependence: given ὅπῃ and Νῆϊον, either the syntactic or the morphologic construction is normal. I agree, however, with our author (p. 64, n.) in seeing no interdependence among 15. 41, 16. 355, 24. 354 (all B), or between 14. 109, 15. 491 (both A).

There remain three instances which seem to me valid. Of these the clearest and least interesting is the dependence of ἡδυπότοι, 2. 340 (B), 3. 391 (T), 15. 507 (T), on ἡδυπότον πίνων, 9. 354, which its author, to judge by 9. 205, 348, would have analyzed as ἡδὺ ποτὸν πίνων. All that we learn is that T—not to mention B—is later than the author of the *Adventure* with the Cyclops.⁴

Leumann has shown (pp. 178–81) that ἐρχάτωντο 14. 15 (A) can be explained only as a derivative from an adjective *ερχάτος. Such an adjective does not exist, but ἐρχαται (3d. pl. perf. of ἐργνυμι) could easily be taken for its nominative plural feminine in

ἔταροι δέ τοι οἷδ' ἐνὶ Κίρκης
ἐρχαται ὥς τε σύες [*Od.* 10. 282–83].

Merkelbach seeks to avoid the conclusion that A is later than Book 10, but to me it seems inevitable (p. 64, n.). The simplicity of the construction is really in favor of Leumann, and a verbless sentence is certainly no difficulty.

I agree also with Leumann (pp. 244–45) against our author (p. 182, n. 2) that νῆρι-

τον, an adjective of uncertain meaning, was intended in

ναϊετάω δ' Ἰθάκην εὐδαίελλον· ἐν δ' ὄρος αὐτῇ
νῆριτον εἰνόςφυλλον ἀριπρετές

9. 21–22, and that from a misunderstanding of this comes the mountain Νήριτον of 13. 351 (A), from which is derived Νήριτος, 17. 207 (A). Then A is later than the author of Book 9.

In view of this evidence it seems to me desirable to give careful consideration to the opinion of Bethe (pp. 109–35) that the *Wanderings of Odysseus* was a self-sufficient poem (Books 5–13), one that knew nothing of any suitors, but looked forward to Odysseus' landing in Ithaca as the end of his tribulations. It had of course a history, and I have no doubt that literary analysis can throw light upon it. Within the space of a review I could not enter upon a full discussion of this, even if I trusted more than I do to my ability to say something of value. I will confine myself to one point.

A source of much trouble is the universal but unfounded belief that the timetable of Odysseus' stay in Scheria is sadly confused. Alkinoos fixes the time for Odysseus' departure (7. 318) as αὔριον "to-morrow." We—in accordance with our way of reckoning—take "to-morrow" to mean the coming period of daylight, but for Alkinoos that is "today"; since he, like all characters in "Homer," reckons his days from sunset and is speaking after sunset (6. 321). I need add little more than a reference to my article "The Beginning of the Greek Day."⁵ Odysseus' consenting to stay ἐς αὔριον costs him nothing.⁶ The only promise made to him was to speed his departure by sunset, and he agrees to stay until sunset.⁷

With the addition of two mentions of the suitors (9. 531–35, 11. 104–20),⁸ the *Wanderings* would make a good opening

5. *AJP*, XXIII (1902), 428–35.

6. On which cf. Schwartz, p. 39.

7. Incidentally, in the *Odyssey* the Phaeacians sail by day or by night. Their return from Ithaca starts just after dawn.

8. Cf. Bethe, pp. 111–13.

4. Carpenter's dating, 640–20 B.C., accepted by the author (p. 55, n.), puts anything else out of the question.

for A, or a good fourth source for B. In either case B would have little reason to alter the Wanderings, and the betraying Atticisms—those collected by Wackernagel—point rather to B*.

Von der Mühl says of 6. 18–19: "*postea insertos esse vid. Duentzer; ἐπέκειντο noviciūm.*" The long vowel of λῦσι at the end of 7. 74 is merely metrical lengthening. To the early recognitions of the interpolating of 7. 94 (cf. *Ameis-Hentze-Anhang*) may be added the approval of Schwartz (p. 311) and of Von der Mühl—ὄντας may well be part of the evidence against it. Wackernagel (pp. 107–9) has shown most clearly that μῆδ' οἱ in 11. 442 is Attic, and that it is not to be corrected to μῆ οἱ. The whole context 434–60 has long been a target for criticism. The only difficulty is to define the interpolation. Von der Mühl cites Nitzsch for the elimination of 441–43; I should prefer—if the scholia may be trusted—to follow Aristophanes and bracket 435–44.⁹ In 8. 133 ἐρώμεθα presents the same problem as ἐρέσθαι (cf. above), and may be treated similarly. The beginning of 8. 368 is corrupt, and in its second half βιώσας shows not an intransitive but a causative meaning, to be explained with Wackernagel (p. 156) as influenced by Attic ἀναβιώσασθαι. I ascribe the line to B*. Wackernagel's attempt (p. 113) to derive κῆρυα, 8. 92, from Attic seems weak. I agree with Leumann (p. 159), and class κῆρυα as a late epic formation (acc. "quasi masculine": κρατός, κρατί) which afterwards influenced Attic Tragedy. The remaining example runs parallel to this. Κραίνω "rule" is found in tragedy, but in Homer this meaning is to be seen only in 8. 391. Wackernagel (p. 157) concludes that the verse was made in Attica. I prefer to believe that the semantic shift took place in late epic, and was imitated in tragedy. It could be left unexplained; but possibly τῶδε μοι κρήνην ἐέλωρ was taken as factitive "make dominant this wish of

mine," besides which the non-factitive present would mean "be dominant, rule."

The analysis of the end of the *Odyssey* hinges on the interpretation of the nineteenth book, with its scene of The Washing of the Feet. If that scene was planned (as Wilamowitz, Schwartz, Bethe, and our author—in my opinion, correctly—believe) to lead up to an ἀναγνώρισις, then B must have had two sources. Schwartz (pp. 121–23) showed the correctness of this interpretation and of its corollary by pointing out that in 21. 274–379 there is a doublet: the bow is brought to Odysseus over the objections of the suitors, once because Penelope intervenes, once because of the intervention of Telemachus.¹⁰ Our author (pp. 9–15) to add further confirmation, revives an idea previously suggested by Kayser (p. 41) and by Seeck (pp. 34ff.). The scene (18. 158–303) in which Penelope elicits gifts from the suitors—a scene often interpreted as ruinous to her character and to that of Odysseus—takes on a different light when it follows an ἀναγνώρισις. Monro (on 18. 282) would have none of this; but, nevertheless, the point seems to me well taken, and I believe the author makes good use of it.¹¹ The Slaying of the Suitors is clearly a combination of two sources¹²: in one (22. 1–99) Odysseus is an archer; in the other (22. 116–501 with some admixture of B's handiwork) he is armed as a hoplite. Both of B's sources are approaching their end: R adds its ἀναγνώρισις (the greater part of 23. 1–240); A closes with a scene (23. 131–34, 141–56, 163, 289–99) of festivity.

The rest of the *Odyssey* is all B's work undertaken for the purpose of putting

10. This disposes also of Wilamowitz' belief that the Washing of the Feet came from a poem too short, perhaps, to be called an epos; and of Bethe's, that it was the end of the earliest version of the *Odyssey* in which there were no suitors.

11. As unitarians often object to transposition, I will mention one I stumbled upon sometime ago. Shakespeare's use of North's Plutarch can be easily traced through the first act of *Coriolanus*, but not until you reach Act II, Sc. iii, 229ff. do you come across his versification of Plutarch's opening sentence.

12. The basic idea of Seeck's book.

9. Schwartz (p. 319) seems inclined toward the same opinion.

FINIS to the story. His sources are an *Einzellied* for the Laertes episode, and for the rest the Telegony. This hypothesis was put forward by Schwartz (pp. 134-56), using the material that had been collected by Hartmann. It is fascinating; but, since it leads into the problems of the condition of the scholia and the analysis of Odysseus' Wanderings, I must refrain from any expression of an opinion.

There is much in the book about which I have not spoken. My endeavor has been simply to report the author's opinions about the most crucial questions, and my agreement or disagreement with them. I may add that he has given very interesting characterizations both of B and of B's sources. A valuable feature of the book is the richness of its references to the work of those who have preceded its author. For all who come after him his work will be indispensable, and they will have good reason to be grateful for it.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING

Ohio State University

Untersuchungen über das lateinische Gerundium und Gerundivum. By PENTTI AALTO. ("Annales academiae scientiarum Fennicae," Ser. B, Vol. LXII, No. 3.) Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1949. Pp. 193.

Gerund and gerundive too are forever being ground and reground. But even the most finely bolted bran is neither appetizing nor wholesome; and everybody has his own recipe for the muffins. It is repugnant to contemplate uncounted hours and tireless industry devoted to yet another attempt to find a conclusive answer to a defeating if not insoluble problem. There is no flaw that I can find in the evidence brought to bear. Yet it misses the mark, for the mark itself is impalpable. The Latin gerund and gerundive are peculiar formations; scattered forms showing an *nd*-suffix in Balto-Slavonic, which come closer than anything else except the

OHG-*nde* and *-nne*, are not really comparable any more than Latin nouns like *glans* (*-ndis*), and even if Hittite *da-an-na*, said to be a dative infinitive, is from **-tnōi*, support for the theory that *-tn-* became *-nd-* in Latin is as exiguous as it is dubious. Even syntax is an uncertain pilot over a precarious course uncharted by beacons and buoys of phonology and morphology alike. But whoever steers to its channel, restricted as it is, at least escapes the adventurous but risky shoals of speculation into prior or tributary sources. In a recent venture of the sort (*CW*, XLIII [1949], 19-22) the precaution was advisedly taken of calling the view there presented as plausible as any—nothing more; and by that judgment I abide.

It is a case of *tot homines*, and must be so until and unless the sources of the Latin gerund and gerundive are discovered, though examples of usage in Latin of ca. 600 B.C. if ever they should turn up, which is unlikely, would be helpful. The consequence is that opinions differ. Aalto thinks the gerund active, substantival, and older than the gerundive; Buck thinks it is simply certain case forms of the (older) gerundive "in its earlier active value"; I think that the gerundive never is, and never was active; I also think the gerund and gerundive contemporaneous for all we know about them. Aalto thinks that the gerund became an adjective in both predicative and attributive (adnominal) position (the latter it surely never had, nor do I see how it could), and thence became passive; Buck also thinks the gerundive was active (he concedes "or middle"), but that it was from the first a participle; I think it was a medio-passive participle from the beginning. Aalto speaks of a passive gerund, I maintain that the gerund is always active; Aalto that it has a nominative, I that what he calls the "nominative" of the gerund is the neuter of the gerundive used multipersonally (*currendum est* like *curritur*). Aalto's argument that the fact that the gerundive has no comparative or superlative forms shows its active sub-

stantival origin is to me unconvincing. He is right, however, in insisting that its use as a future passive participle is late, and the term future passive participle ought to be removed from all descriptions of the gerundive in authors older than the third century of our era. But I cannot agree that the gerundive in Osco-Umbrian was borrowed from Latin. Why indeed? The meaning of obligation and necessity, Aalto correctly observes, is found in passive participles in other languages; but this very commonplace fact, if it points to anything, points only to the conclusion that the gerundive is actually and properly a present participle passive. It is an unkind mischance that the adjectives in *-cundus* and *-bundus* (of which he gives what must be a complete or almost complete list of 149 items from *adminicula-bundus* in *Itin. Alex.* to *uolutabundus* Cic., including *labibundus* taken from Gradenwitz and *muscitabundus* from the Glossaries, neither of them much help; and one of which has a comparative, namely *tremebundior* in Columella, and two adverbs in *-e*, viz. *furibunde* Jerome, *plorabunde* Porphyrio) are even more isolated formations than the gerundive proper (compare with it at least in its usage the Skt. gerundive in *-anīya*, Whitney § 965), though *-bundus* is likely to contain *-bhya-* (*deplorabundus* Plaut.: *deplorabo*, *-bam*, but *deplorabundus* is neither passive nor future). As for *-cundus*, it defeats analysis; the current view finds a starting point in *secundus*, but at the date assumed that had *-qu-* not *-c-*, and it is in any event far too slender a foundation (even with *facundus* or *dicundus* thrown in) to sustain so large and wide an analogy. Analogy in language never proceeds from the unusual; it is the irregular or rare variant that is disfavored.

But the subject is threadbare, and no laborious reweaving, however devoted and conscientious, will make whole cloth out of it.

The offending misprint is on page 151 (Lewis-Pedersen, not Petersen).

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

Histoire de la racine nem- en grec ancien.

By E. LAROCHE. ("Études et commentaires," No. VI.) Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1949. Pp. 275.

"Dullness" sang Pope "never dies." And Ward comments: "She is a monster with many heads, or apologies for heads, and many hands, with a pen in each." The trouble with Laroche's treatise is exhaustiveness without selectivity, perspiration without inspiration, and a final chapter of conclusion that is inconclusive. No need to await a new Stephanus or *Thesaurus linguae Graecae* for νέμω and related words. From Homer to Aristotle, in inscriptions and in papyri "la racine *nem-*... a connu en grec une grande fortune." Laroche's undertaking is professedly more than "entreprendre le classement de tous les mots apparentés, grâce à un dépouillement aussi vaste que possible"; but, professions notwithstanding, the promised synthesis is no more than a *ridiculus mus*. This inundation of ancient usage (in context) is overwhelming in its abundance, topped by translation, and stirring up a muddy undertow of notes and references. Nothing seems to have been overlooked, nothing omitted.

More she had spoke, but yawn'd—All
Nature nods:

What Mortal can resist the Yawn of Gods?

Walde-Pokorny distinguishes two I. Eu. homonymous "roots" **nem-*; in *BSL*, XXXII (1931), 85 this number becomes three; when we reach Greek, Laroche (p. 255) expands it to five ("au point de vue du grec historique, cinq séries irréductibles se sont constituées sous la même [?] racine **nem*"). But his investigation is on old-fashioned lines, sound enough in its description and interpretation of Greek usage; as an essay in unraveling one of the longest and most colorful threads in the tracery, the pattern that runs through the fabric of meaning, the very warp and woof, of the Greek language, which made the Greek's world rational and intelligible to him, just as the fabric of meaning in

English does for us, or in French for a Frenchman, it is totally uninspired, unenlightened and unilluminating, unnecessarily complicated and involved. Perhaps Laroche did not intend this; perhaps he intended, as he has given us, complete or nearly complete knowledge of νέμω, νέμομαι, νέμεσις, νόμος, νομίζω, νομός, νέμος, νομή, νομάω and the rest.

But "knowledge for what"? Are we any wiser for our knowledge? Investigations on such lines lead nowhere, any more than Paschall's abbreviated study (*University of California Publications in Linguistics*, I [1943], 1-10), which Laroche, forgetting the adage about glass houses and throwing stones, roundly condemns (p. 258). Homonyms or partial homonyms appear in all languages. How are we to cope with them? It will not do, as in the dictionaries, e.g., of English, to distinguish, say *spring* A (1) vb. trans., (2) vb. intrans.; and B noun, with five or six discriminated meanings, which, on Laroche's method, would give us seven or eight "séries irréductibles." True there may be distinction of accent (νομή, νομός, νόμος), whether stress or pitch, and of inflexion or of stem (νομή, νομός, νέμος, *nemus*) and voice (e.g., νέμομαι). But these can be shown to be in part secondary, and to conform to the devices of the particular language involved.

There are at least two lines of enquiry that should not be neglected. First, and this is not novel, a comparative study of the vocabularies of other languages and families of languages. For *nem-* a start should be made with items of comparable categories of meanings in a pastoral or nomadic society (νομός, νέμω, νέμος, νομός), its rules and regulations, penalties and duties, rewards and payments (Italic *nummis emere*; Germanic *niman*; Lith. *nuoma* "rent, usury," Sicel νοῦμμος, cf. *pecunia*, *pecu(s)*, *fee*, *Vieh*), the assignment of its produce in food and drink (νέμω), the growth of its customary law (νόμος) and of the institution of property and possession, especially of habitations (νέμομαι). Then there is the host of compounds (e.g., ολο-, αλγ-, ἱππο-νομος, ἀπο-, ἐπι-, κατα-

νέμω) and of derivatives (νεμέτωρ, νεμεσητικός), to be tied in with all these, the collection of which by the industrious Laroche puts the material into the hands of anyone with a head to use it; and, what might have been predicted almost as a matter of course, a host also of proper names, local (Νεμέα, Νεμωσσός, *Augustonemetum*, *Nantuates*), divine (*Nemetiales*, *Nimidi DAG*, pp. 82, 86), and personal (Ἀμφι-, Εὐρύ-νομος), most of them again collected by Laroche, and, no doubt, all of the Greek ones. It is no secret that Indonesian or Aranta, Bantu or Semitic throw light on such enquiries, conducted that is in obedience to the principles of primary correspondence of meaning to the features of experience in the external world; of movement from specific to generalized meaning; and of meaning traced through universals to particulars.

But it is less well known that there are new important and pertinent means of enquiry afoot. What is the limit of toleration of homonyms both in perception (hearing) and in performance or operation (i. e., utterance)? What determines the choice between alternative units of information? Statistical investigations are now being undertaken of these and related questions which approach mathematical rigor and elegance. Again, it is already known that adults usually show greater generalization for synonyms than for homophones, but that children tend to generalize more readily to homophones; what about "primitive" and "mature" societies? It is also known that homonyms have a greater facilitating effect in the usage (i. e., memory?) of intraverbally associated items of vocabulary. Here are procedures of semantic investigation far more promising than the threadbare method of mere compilation and classification. Analysis calls for synthesis. Imagination, free invention is part of discovery, and more vital than an antlike accumulation of "postage stamp" facts.

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

Manuel des particules grecques. By DANIEL LABÉY. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1950. Pp. xvi + 86.

At Shrewsbury Kennedy used to print Latin "unseens" without any punctuation except the full point. A Greek text may well offer no more difficulty of comprehension even to a first editor. The tell-tale δέ or γάρ will mark pauses, almost like the sound of a warning bell. The more elaborate the style, in Attic prose and conspicuously in the orators or Plato, contrasted with even long inscriptions or Hellenistic prose, the more refined the import or the tenor, of the short, often monosyllabic, uninflected bits of utterance ("particles") tends to be. Not only the more pronounced intervals (: and ; as well as .), but the weaker one (,)—or, regarded as marks of continuity, the more direct flow of speech (,) as well as the less (; and :), all the way to a strong contrast (like the Latin adversative assyndeton) or complete pause, ending finally in silence—all these in modern English, for example, and in most modern European languages, are not verbalized at all. They are what are called in current parlance "zero" elements, except of course in their written form ("comma" etc.). But in Greek they are discrete vocables, i.e., "words." In a sense, therefore, Greek particles are marks of punctuation, as Labéy says. But some of them are always more than that (particularly the compounded ones, e.g., οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ . . . [γε]), and on occasion any of them may be, even the weak enclitic τοί (compare the affirmative particle of spoken Welsh, always used before a verb at the beginning of a direct positive statement, except in answering questions) "look you, mark you." Nor are particles strictly a mark solely of the written language, as Labéy more than once declares; his own classification gives the lie to that.

But his handbook is, with this qualification of an exaggerated statement of a correct principle, accurate and instructive, concise and clear. His few well-selected

examples command better attention than a ton-weight tome.

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

Römische Satiren. With an Introduction and Translations by OTTO WEINREICH. ("Die Bibliothek der alten Welt," Roman series, edited by KARL HOENN.) Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1949. Pp. civ + 431 + 7 pls. Fr. 16.80.

The first volume to appear in the Roman series of this attractively produced library of classical and patristic authors in translation bears the name of a veteran scholar whose published work on satire alone extends over the space of one generation. Weinreich has selected the obvious eight satirists, but, according to him, satisfactory attempts in the past to turn them into German are not so easily found. Consequently he has translated his own selections of Ennius, Lucilius, Varro (apart from *Men.* 111 and 269-72 in Mommsen's alexandrines), and Petronius, as well as Horace *Sat.* 1. 2, Persius *Prol.* and *Sat.* 2, and Juvenal 1, 3, 5, 6, 9; and he has slightly revised the spirited rendering which accompanied his *Senecas Apocolocyntosis* (Berlin, 1923). The only versions by others which he has thought worthy of adoption are Horace's *Satires* (apart from 1. 2) in free iambs by Wieland (1804), Persius 1, 3, 5 in rhyming iambs by H. Blümner (1897), and Juvenal 10 by his own pupil, A. Maisack. So far as the reviewer can judge, Weinreich's importations happily match his own general success as a translator.

The introduction is mainly concerned with the history of Roman satire from its origins to the survivals of the Lucilian spirit in Claudian and of the Menippean tradition in Martianus Capella and Boethius. The few pages which deal subsequently with its influence in medieval and modern times should be particularly welcomed by the public for whom the book is intended, although this is too large a subject to re-

ceive more than cursory treatment in the space available. Students of English literature will have to be content with allusions to Wyatt, Nash, Hall (for the inspiration of whose *Virgidemiarum* Juvenal rather than Horace should have been held responsible on p. xcvi), Donne, and Butler; for nothing is said of Marston, Dryden, Swift, Pope, Johnson, or Byron.

On page 302 the words "'Spüte dich,' ruft Mercur, 'und melde, wir kommen!'" should be added to the second paragraph from Weinreich's earlier translation of the *Apocolocyntosis* as a rendering of "celerius' inquit Mercurius 'et venire nos nuntia'" (13. 2), and the "Minervaque ducente" of Petronius 29 is ignored on page 320. A short and somewhat haphazard bibliography on pp. 426-28 adds an unnecessary letter to the names of Geffcken and Wili, gives Wight Duff a false initial, and on one of two occasions bestows on Lejay the acute accent which is denied to Boyancé. There are also misprints on pages xiii, xxiii, xxxvii, xlv, xciii, ciii, 39, 201, and 428. On page lv the birthday of Persius should be 4 December.

The plates are relevant to the subject and enhance the appearance of a neat little work, which is dedicated to Arthur Darby Nock in remembrance of former associations at Tübingen and Lund. The first five volumes in the Greek series of "Die Bibliothek der alten Welt" were issued during 1948, and the whole venture is to be wished every success in furthering the cause of humanism.

ROBERT J. GETTY

University of Toronto

The Letters of Alciphron, Aelian, and Philostratus. With an English Translation by † ALLEN ROGERS BENNER and FRANCIS H. FOBES. ("Loeb Classical Library," No. 383.) Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1949. Pp. xii + 588. \$3.00.

With this new volume the Loeb series enters the large but comparatively little known field of Greek fictional epistolography. The choice of authors is a little unexpected. Alciphron's letters are certainly the best, and Aelian's, though much inferior, deserved re-editing and translating. But for the third, why select Philostratus, whose tedious rhetoric apes both the *Musa Amatoria* and the *Musa Puerilis* for one hundred and thirty pages of text and translation? Aristaenetus had much more deserved the space, or even Theophylactus Simocattes.

The division of the work between the two editors is as follows. Mr. Benner had completed at least the first draft of the translations of all three authors, and had established a text of Alciphron with the first draft of an *apparatus*. The text and *apparatus* of Aelian and Philostratus and all explanatory notes and introductory matter are by Mr. Fobes, with some emendations contributed by the editors-in-chief. In the case of Aelian and Philostratus the translations are the first ever to be made in English and are therefore most welcome. All three translations are accurate, as one would expect. However, one must admit that the element of sprightliness which the subject matter so often demands is too frequently lacking. To take an instance at random, why is it any more accurate to say "What good work have you done and what noble deed have you achieved by toil?" (*Ep.* 4, p. 355) than "What about you? Have you got a good job done and put in some honest hard work?" And why must translators of the classics still sprinkle obviously colloquial passages with words like *rascally*, *clever*, *sire*, *ditties*, *paltry*, *wretch*, *carouse*, *unmannerly*, *husbandry*, *scoundrel*, *lad*, *cursèd*, etc.?

The chief scientific value of this volume lies in the construction of the texts, particularly that of Aelian. In the case of Alciphron the work of the editors rests "almost wholly on the two editions of Schepers (as supplemented by Castiglioni)" and no first hand examination of

manuscripts or photostats was possible. We have, nevertheless, a reliable text, which admits from the manuscripts considerably more late or rare forms and constructions than were allowed by Hercher or Schepers. This is quite proper. The influence of Cobet's "normalizing" methods lasted far too long. The present editors venture to print about thirty of their own emendations, of which one half are admitted into their text. The proportion is a little high, but most are very slight, none are objectionable, and Post's $\pi\acute{\alpha}\zeta$ for $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\zeta$ in 4. 18. 14 is brilliant.

Most of the labor on the text of Philostratus consisted in disentangling the critical *apparatus* of Kayser's edition, on which the editors rely almost exclusively, and in restoring by the use of half-brackets to their proper place in the text the previously excised material of the longer tradition. The work seems to be conscientiously done despite great difficulties, and we should be grateful that anyone considered Philostratus worth the trouble.

The text of Aelian's *Letters of Farmers* is the high point of the whole volume. It represents the first important improvement since the edition of Musurus (Aldus, 1499) on which all previous editors have based their work. The present editors have for the first time made use of a collation, published by Di Stefani in 1901, of a good independent tenth century manuscript, A (Ambrosianus B 4 sup.), and of photostats of a fifteenth century manuscript, M (Matritensis 4693), which is very similar apparently to Musurus' unknown codex. The Madrid manuscript is rather disappointing and rarely adds anything of value to the Aldine text. The Ambrosianus, however, offers some ninety variants from Hercher's text, and one third of them either confirm previous necessary conjectures or are so convincing that they are recommended by Di Stefani for inclusion in the text. The present editors with understandable enthusiasm adopt all thirty, and rightly, I believe. In certain other cases, however, where A confirms suspected readings of M and Ald, they

have, I think, been overinfluenced. So in *Ep.* 4 (p. 354) the consensus of A with the others in reading $\sigmaυκιδίων$ ("little figs") does not alter the fact that the context requires Hercher's emendation $\sigmaυκίδων$ ("fig-cuttings"). Again in *Ep.* 3 (p. 354) despite A's confirmation, the reading $\sigmaτενάζαι$ (aor. opt. 3 s.) should not stand in view of Aelian's almost exclusive use of the "Aeolic" form elsewhere (*vid.* Schmid, *Atticismus*, III, 30). Once more in *Ep.* 19 (p. 380) A's support to the $\sigmaυναπολαμβάνη$ of M and Ald indicates nothing except that this obvious misreading for $\sigmaυνεπιλαμβάνη$ (as restored by Hemsterhuys) goes back at least to the tenth century. On the other hand, A's reading of $\lambdaύπην$ in *Ep.* 13 (p. 368) seems to me quite worthy of acceptance.

Of the five emendations made by the editors, two, I think, are open to objection. In *Ep.* 5 (p. 356) all manuscripts offer the colorless and almost meaningless reading $\piερί αὐτά$. Post proposes $\piερίλυτα$, which Fobes accepts into the text. Now $\piερίλυτα$ in the sense of "repudiata" should exist, since the abstract $\piερίλυσις$ ("repudium") is found. But it doesn't—and scholarship is understandably hesitant in accepting non-attested forms in conjectures, however attractive and ingenious. Could one not read $\piερίλυπα$? In *Ep.* 17 (p. 376). I am completely at a loss to understand Fobes's $\acute{\alpha}\nuεῦροις$ for the manuscript consensus of $\acute{\alpha}\nuεῦρες$. The translation, "that you would find . . .," certainly seems to point to Di Stefani's conjecture $\acute{\alpha}\nuευρήσεις$. A much simpler solution to my mind would be to read $οὐκ \acute{\epsilon}\gammaώ \acute{\epsilon}\lambdaεγον σοι$; (instead of $\delta\tauι$) and then to retain the $\acute{\alpha}\nuεῦρες$ of the manuscripts in a new sentence.

Finally the volume concludes with an index of proper names and a brief but useful Greek subject index for each of the three authors.

WARREN E. BLAKE

University of Michigan

Aristotle's Constitution of Athens and Related Texts. Translated with an Introduction and Notes by KURT VON FRITZ and ERNST KAPP. New York: Hafner Publishing Company, 1950. Pp. xii + 233. \$1.25 paper bound, \$2.50 cloth.

To provide a usable annotated translation, well bound and well printed, of these texts at a reasonable price is a genuine service, and the publishers as well as Professors von Fritz and Kapp deserve our thanks. Incidentally, the paper bound edition is well enough put together to hold up under use in the classroom. The two scholars are unusually well qualified for their task as translators and have given a readable and, on the whole, reliable English version. They have also done well with the interpretation when only Aristotle's own account and such obvious versions as that of Thucydides are concerned. Hence the discussion of the revolutions of 411 B.C. is excellent. So also is the account of the selection and composition of the juries, and it is a pleasure at last to have a translation with a correct interpretation of *kleroteria*. Yet, for those who wish to use Aristotle's account as a starting point for the study of Athenian constitutional history, the edition leaves much to be desired. There are not sufficient references either to sources or to secondary works, and there are important subjects which are not discussed at all. On the date of the origin of ostracism it is not sufficient to cite (n. 57) Meritt's incidental discussion in *Hesperia*, VIII, 63. The student should at least be referred to the evidence of Androtion and be told what the problem is. On ostracism one also misses any reference to information concerning procedure or to the fascinating manner in which the discovery of hundreds of ostraca by excavators in recent years is increasing our knowledge and also raising new questions. Still worse, in spite of a rather lengthy discussion of Draco, the reader is given no hint of the extent of the literature on the constitution of Draco and of the un-

animity with which qualified scholars have rejected the constitution as unhistorical and a forgery. In his review of Bonner and Smith, *The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle*, Vol. I (Chicago, 1930) the late Professor Glotz characterized the excursus on "The So-Called Draconian Constitution" as unnecessary on the ground that it merely confirmed a fact already established (*Rev. ét. gr.*, XLV [1932], 339). To give another illustration of the point of view of scholars, J. A. R. Munro, while discussing another constitution, speaks of the temptation to "relegate it to the shelf whereon Draco's [constitution] reposes" (*Class. Quart.*, XXXIII [1939], 87). Bonner and Smith's excursus was not unnatural for the reason that the rejection of the Draconian constitution had not been recognized as generally as it should have been. Be that as it may, the manner in which earlier scholarship on the subject has been disregarded in this country is almost a national disgrace.¹

J. A. O. LARSEN

University of Chicago

1. Other examples are: W. K. Prentice, *The Ancient Greeks* (Princeton, 1940), pp. 128f.; F. B. Marsh, *Modern Problems in the Ancient World* (Austin, 1943), pp. 15, 18; J. H. Oliver, *The Athenian Expounders of the Sacred and Ancestral Law* (Baltimore, 1950), p. 68. On this particular point L. C. Stecchini, *The Constitution of the Athenians by the Old Oligarch and by Aristotle* (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1950), pp. 101f., n. 11 is better, but the author's easy and positive dogmatism is objectionable, and his references to scholars at times misleading. Thus the reader gets the impression that De Sanctis, *Atthis*⁴, p. 162 accepts the constitution of Draco as genuine. On this page De Sanctis actually states that it is an insertion which interrupts the course of the argument. After a brief discussion he concludes that Aristotle when he wrote the *Politics* and when he composed the *Constitution of the Athenians* was not aware that there was any constitution of Draco. When he later came upon it unexpectedly, he inserted it in his *Constitution* altering two or three phrases in the latter in order that the new insertion should not contradict the rest too obviously (p. 163). The work which misled Aristotle was an oligarchic forgery (pp. 165f.). Thus, from Stecchini's point of view, there is little objectionable except the statement that the insertion was due to Aristotle himself, but this is at least as good a guess as Stecchini's own that both the forgery and insertion are due to Demetrius of Phalerum. If it is necessary to be shocked by the error of a great scholar, why not cite Wilamowitz, *Aristoteles und Athen*, I, 57-59 and 76-98?

La crisi del 411 A.C. nell'Athenaion Politeia di Aristotele. By FRANCO SARTORI. ("Università di Padova, Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia," Vol. XXVI.) Padova: Cedam, Casa editrice Dott. Antonio Milani, 1951. Pp. viii + 135. L. 1000.

This is another careful study to add to the mass which the serious student of the revolutions at Athens of 411 B.C. has to struggle through before he can feel that he has covered the literature. Yet all it does for those who already have studied the subject is to give them a few more plausible conjectures and to confirm them in the conviction that agreement will never be reached unless by some miracle important new evidence is discovered. In fact, the situation is almost becoming appalling, for so often a new study does not add one more brick to a structure begun by others but offers a completely new plan for a totally new structure. On the other hand, for those who have not yet studied the problem, Sartori's book can serve as a good introduction provided also a number of other interpretations are carefully considered.

Recent contributions to the study of the Four Hundred and the Five Thousand have mostly been in the form of articles. Sartori, however, has a good excuse for the greater length of his offering in that he is attempting to prove that the accounts of Thucydides and of Aristotle, instead of clashing, are in essential agreement. The author's other chief interest is represented by rather finespun arguments about the legality of the various measures. Thus, in connection with the abolition of the *graphe paranomon*, he fails to cite the similar preliminary suspension of guarantees in connection with the use of the special reserve of a thousand talents (Thuc. 8. 15. 1; cf. 2. 24. 1) but offers the argument that the abolition could have been checked at the time by the use of the *graphe* itself, but, when this was not done and when the abolition had been approved by the *ekklesia*, it was perfectly legal

(p. 35). This is at the same time too subtle and too easy. The abolition of the *graphe* to facilitate the adoption of a new constitution, no matter what pretence there may have been of regular procedure, meant revolution. No doubt, many felt that the abolition was illegal and that a suit for its cancelation and thus for the restoration of the *graphe* was technically justified, but the time for such measures had passed and revolution had to be countered by revolution.

In his attempts to reconcile Thucydides and Aristotle the author goes to considerable length. Almost the only major discrepancy which he considers irreconcilable is that between the ten *syngrapheis* of Thucydides and the thirty of Aristotle (pp. 21f.). He has no difficulty with the two accounts of the method of selecting the Four Hundred. Aristotle reports the election of a hundred cataloguers, ten from each tribe, and later the election of four hundred councillors, forty from each tribe, chosen from men selected in advance by the tribesmen (*Ath. pol.* 29. 5 and 31.1); Thucydides (8. 67. 3), the election of five *proëdroi*, who elected one hundred, who in turn co-opted three hundred. It is suggested that the tribesmen performed the advance selection of candidates, as Aristotle reports, and that both the hundred selected according to Thucydides by the *proëdroi* and the three hundred later co-opted were chosen from among these candidates (pp. 52ff.). This may seem far-fetched but is not completely impossible. However, neither the author's argumentation nor workmanship is always sound. He argues that the inclusion of the ten *probouloi* among the later *syngrapheis* shows that the latter were moderate oligarchs (p. 40 and n. 30); it is just as plausible to argue that the inclusion of the *probouloi* was intended to give the impression of moderation while the twenty new members actually could outvote them and thus nullify their influence. In *Ath. pol.* 29. 5 he incorrectly takes *οἱ ἀνδρες* as a reference to the archons and prytaneis in office at the time and so is able to

argue that their successors were unpaid and that there thus is no real contradiction of the statement of Thucydides (8. 67. 3) that all pay was abolished (p. 41). Is there any need of demonstrating that this is a mistranslation? Similarly in *Ath. pol.* 30. 2 he takes τῶν ἀεὶ βουλευόντων to be those qualified to serve in the *boule* instead of those actually serving (p. 112). The latter statement is part of a new and more startling than convincing interpretation of the "constitution for the future."

J. A. O. LARSEN

University of Chicago

A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 A.D.,
Compiled by ALEXANDER SOUTER. New
York: Oxford University Press, 1949.
Pp. xxxii + 454. \$10.50.

The new *Oxford Latin Dictionary* will be based on a fresh collection of well over a million quotations; it will give a much fuller analysis of the meanings of words than any existing Latin-English dictionary; and it will be about one-third larger than Lewis and Short. We are assured, moreover, that the work will be completed within a reasonable time.

The *Dictionary*, however, is to be restricted to the classical period, from the beginnings to the close of the second century of our era. Thus Christian literature will be excluded, as well as the many pagan documents, both literary and epigraphic, which attest the continued development of the Latin language after that point.

The present generous volume is designed to supplement the *Dictionary*, listing the new forms, meanings, and phrases which occur for the first time after about A.D. 180, so that students may have some help in reading the later literature. This modest purpose it certainly fulfills, and it will be most welcome and indeed indispensable. Its execution is not perfect in all details, however, and its plan will not fully satisfy those students of the whole of Latinity who regret the *Dictionary's* narrowed scope, however admirable

its scale. That is, the two works together will not completely supersede Lewis and Short.

The work is of necessity a Glossary, not a Dictionary. While it contains about 27,000 entries, nearly all of them are very short. For words which are fairly common in this period, only definitions are given, with occasionally an indication of date and spread, or comment on the paleographic validity or linguistic interest of the form. For the many rare words and meanings, however, explicit references are made to the passages in which they occur, including both formal literature and inscriptions. Abbreviations are explained in an impressive 23-page list of authors, works, dates, and editions. This list, which brings the Index-volume of the *Thesaurus* up to date for the period, will be in itself a convenient work of reference, not least for revealing at a glance in what volume of the *CSEL*, the *MGH*, or of Migne a given work is to be found. The student should be warned, however, that in some cases it is still necessary to consult the fuller information available in the *Thesaurus'* list.¹

The extent to which Souter has enlarged upon Lewis and Short may be estimated by the fact that, of his 590 entries between *mabsar* and *membrus*, about 260, or 44 per cent, record words (not merely meanings) that are not to be found in Lewis and Short. (The figures above are approximations, but they do not include the abundant cross-references identifying unusual forms.) No fewer than sixteen of these words, moreover, are not to be found in the *Thesaurus* either; but it should be noted that for most of them there are good reasons for their exclusion. One (*Malachias*) is a proper name, and

1. E. g., under *manuator* Souter refers to SS. *Ruth* 2. 15 cod. Complut. His list of authors (p. xxv) names only an edition of Bensly, which is restricted to 4 Esdras. For the readings of Complut. elsewhere one must consult an article by Berger, which is listed in the *Thesaurus*. Souter's list under Dioscurides distinguishes the Latin version and the Greek glosses which cite Latin equivalents, as Diosc. and Diosc. Vind. respectively, but his list fails to give complete references to the former and his citations often fail to observe the distinction; see below.

another (*manichizo*) is a derivative of a proper name. One (*martyrus*) is from a text not yet published, and two more (*magniloquens*, *mediotenus*) are from texts published in the thirties, perhaps too recently to have been recorded in this fascicle of the *Thesaurus*. One word (*masomenon*) is definitely Greek, and another (*meconicos*) is only half Latin; see below. Two words (*mammocoetis*, *marica*) represent doubtful readings which have been altered in texts more recent than those used by Souter; and two others, I am sorry to say, are not to be found in the passages referred to: *macilens* in Agnellus (Migne 68. 381-86) and *mellaster* in Galen. *Alfabet*. 216.² However, five words remain: *macarius*, *magnificator*, *maleficus*, *manuator*, and *maximiores*. These seem to be both sound and within the purview of the *Thesaurus*.

Some of the faults as well as the great merits of Souter's work are suggested here; but our comparison of the *Glossary* with Lewis and Short also leads to the observation of some imperfections in plan which will make the combined *Glossary* and *Dictionary* less useful than they might have been.

Both Lewis and Short and the *Thesaurus* regularly cite from glossaries and the *Notae Tironianae*, even when they record words not attested elsewhere, for presumably these words were read in texts, or they would not have been entered in the glossaries. Souter (Preface, p. vi) notes Mayor's interest in the rediscovery of such glossarial words, but he omits them entirely, on the plea that sizable manuscripts of the glossaries begin only in the eighth century of our era. On the other hand, he does include some novel words (e.g., *petraria*, *tornatrix*) found only in *Randglossen* (and not as lemmata) in tenth-century manuscripts of Nonius (see

Lindsay in *ALL*, IX, 599)—whose date falls within his period.³ Similarly, he faithfully cites such *voces nihili* as *mimperta* and *myrrhago* (and see below on *tarundu minus*). It is understandable that Souter's interests were those of the paleographer rather than critic, but some definite policy with regard to the glossaries and glossarial words should have been worked out by the board responsible for the *Dictionary*. Editors of texts of all periods need these words in their business.

It may be answered that this work was compiled for the benefit of students, not editors. Students will not be helped, however, by another kind of omission. This is the case of rare and sometimes difficult words which occur in late writers but are not noticed by Souter because they are also attested for the earlier period. Compare (in the *Thesaurus*) *ampliuscule*, found in Plautus (once, as emended), then only in Sidonius and Claudianus Mamertus; *circumtego*, once in Naevius, then in Christian texts, Dictys, etc.; *machinula*, in Festus (*teste Paulo*) and the glossaries, then in Hilary and Paulinus of Nola; and many others. In these cases of conscious or unconscious archaism the lines of exclusion should not have been drawn so rigidly, and conversely it is very much to be hoped that the new *Dictionary* will list such occurrences in later writers also. Otherwise, the comparison of the two works, which will often have to be used together, will give a very misleading idea of the currency of many words in Latinity as a whole. The *Nachleben* of such words is more significant than their genesis.

At this point it is pertinent to inquire whether, if the new *Dictionary* applies the chronological criterion as strictly as Souter has, it will succeed in dealing adequately with the history of still other words. For

2. At least, I could not find it after a reasonably diligent search in the third Juntine edition of the works of Galen (Venice, 1556). An uncomfortably large portion (about 7 percent) of the 200-odd references which I checked are either false (see the corrections in the list below) or unverifiable (references to *CIL* under *rutarius*, *tegarium*, *telestinus*).

3. My colleague R. P. Oliver points out that Souter has included one novel word, but only one (*friatura*), from the long interpolation in *Met.* 10. 21, evidently assuming that the passage, while not by Apuleius himself (which would have put it out of Souter's period), was still earlier than A.D. 600. (This may have been a last-minute borrowing by Souter from the *Thesaurus*, which also records the word.)

there are some whose semantic development within the classical period will be puzzling unless later usages are also considered, both in the apparently "new" meanings recorded by Souter and in the old meanings. For example, my analysis of the central meaning of the word *nenia* as 'plaything,' not 'dirge,' was greatly aided by the discovery that a passage of Prudentius preserves this meaning, elsewhere apparent only in Plautus and Petronius.⁴ We hope the editors of the new *Dictionary* will be able to refer to, if not to cite, materials gathered by Souter and other lexicographers, even when they are dated later than A.D. 180.

In other words, a certain amount of overlapping between the *Glossary* and the *Dictionary* should not only not have been avoided, but encouraged, for the chronological limits are highly artificial. In the case of epigraphical material, however, an arbitrary distinction should have been made, but was not. For the vocabulary of the inscriptions, Souter acknowledges the help of another member of the *Dictionary* staff, who at his request noted examples for the period after A.D. 180—but he does not say how the inscriptions were to be divided fore and aft of so narrow a point. Obviously, very few of them can be dated precisely; the only practical procedure, unless a great amount of overlapping was to be allowed, was to adopt an arbitrary rule, e.g., that all inscriptions which can be assigned with reasonable certainty to the Augustan age or before should fall within the *Dictionary's* domain, but that all other inscriptions, unless they can be dated with absolute certainty to the period before 180, should be assigned to Souter. This would have had the advantage of placing all or most of the vulgar materials from the inscriptions side by side with the abundant evidence for vulgar phenomena drawn by Souter from literary sources. As it is now, the performance is very uneven. For example, the form *acerbis* (for *acerba*) in *CIL*, XI, 6078 is noted in the *Thesaurus*

s.v. "*acerbus*," with which the adverb *acerbiter* occurring in Ps. Aug. *Cogn. verae vitae* 1 is to be compared. Souter has *acerbiter* but not *acerbis*, and he omits many other words and forms listed, e.g., in the "Wortverzeichnis" of Diehl's handy collection of *Vulgärlateinische Inschriften*. Similarly, while much good material from the inscriptions is included, Souter is in general more diligent in recording variant spellings from manuscripts than from inscriptions—where they are rather more significant as linguistic data.

At one time, it was planned to reissue Souter's *Glossary* on thin paper as an integral part of the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Is it too much to hope that this plan will be carried out, and that the *Glossary* will then be revised and supplemented so as to make the two works together more useful for the student of the whole of Latinity?

Revision is needed at some other points, of course. The following notes are derived mainly from a rather close but desultory study of the second part of the book.

alearis, 'of a game of chance' (Cael. Aur. *Chron.* 2. 1. 25): Souter (Preface, p. vi) notes the occurrence of a great many scientific terms in his list, and hopes that their presence will encourage the study of, e.g., the old Latin medical writers. His wish is in part fulfilled by Drabkin's important article on Caelius Aurelianus in *TAPA*, LXXVI (1945), 299–320, which appeared too late for Souter to make use of. Here, Drabkin (p. 311) notes that *alearis* is senseless, and reads *tiliaris*, convincingly. The entry can disappear ultimately, but should probably be retained for the present, provided it is marked as a false reading. Such ghosts should be retained in dictionaries for some time after they have been laid in special articles or editions; see below on *marica* and *tarundu minus*.

hamarthritus . . . , 'gout in all limbs at once' (Cael. Aur. *Chron.* 5. 2. 28): Drabkin (p. 318f.) convincingly disposes of the word and the disease, but again the lemma should be retained, with the notation "false reading in . . ."

magnificator, 'benefactor' (Philo *Quaest. in gen.* 4. 215 p. 246 R): The reference, not ex-

4. See *TAPA*, LXXIV (1943), 248–50, 263.

plained either in the *Thesaurus* Index or Souter's list, is to an old Latin version of chapters 154–245 of book 4 of this work, which is otherwise known only in an Armenian version. See *Philonis opera omnia*, ed. Richter, Vol. VII (1830). It is strange that the *Thesaurus* has the very next word in the passage (*melioratus*), but not this one.

mammocoetis (μαμμοκοιτης), 'sucking, suckling' (Apic. 8. 364): This is Schuch's emendation for *mammotestus* of the MSS, which is retained—*faute de mieux*—by Giarratano and Vollmer; see the *Thesaurus* s. v. "mammoth-reptus". In this case Souter's choice of a variant is certainly defensible, and cross-reference is unnecessary; but the reading should be marked as conjectural.

manco (*manctuma*) . . . : Read *mancatum*.

marica, *radix* 'Illyrian iris' (Diosc. 1. 1): The reference should be to Diosc. Vind. 1. 1, where Wellmann reads ῥάδιζ μουρικᾶ(τα), comparing Plin. *NH* 20. 262. The *Thesaurus* will have this occurrence s. v. "muriciatus". In this case Souter's entry can be deleted: by this time Wellmann's edition has laid Stadler's ghosts.

masomenon (μασόμενον), 'method of mastication' (Cass. Fel. 32): But the context marks the word as Greek, not Latin: *masticatorium*, *quem Graeci masomenon vocant*.

matrigua . . . : Read *matrigna*.

meconicus (μηχανικός), 'of the poppy' (Plin. *Val.* 4. 8): Read *meconicos* . . . 4. 18. The passage runs: *capita papaveris et folia eius decocta meconicon faciunt medicamentum*. It is difficult if not impossible to determine just when a word in one language becomes part of the vocabulary of another language; see Haugen's illuminating article, *Language*, XXVI (1950), 210–31. In the case of Greek and Latin, dictionaries should probably record all transliterations (except of course, in a Latin dictionary, words marked by the context as Greek, like *masomenon* above, or, in a Greek dictionary, those marked as Latin, like the Latin words in Diosc. Vind.), but they should be careful to record precisely the facts as to change of ending, inflection, or gender.

meioa . . . Diosc. 4. 99: Read Diosc. Vind. 4. 100. Here Wellmann prints his own conjecture ἡμίνουλα (i. e., *eminola*, from *eminere*), but Hofmann more conservatively retains the reading of the MSS in the *Thesaurus*.

melita . . . Diosc. 3. 107: Read Diosc. Vind.

3. 103, and see the *Thesaurus* s. v. "mel-litus," 3.

menotyrrannus, 'king of the months' (*CIL* 6. 7499): Read 'Lord of the Moon' . . . 6.499.

misco (v. III) = *misceo* [saec. iv on . . .]: But if Lindsay is right (*Handbook of Latin Inscriptions*, p. 32), the form *misc.* on a Praenestine cista (*CIL*, I², 560) is a syn-copated imperative *misc(ē)*. In cases like this, cross-reference should be made from the *Glossary* to the *Dictionary*, and vice versa.

modricativus, 'pungent' (Cael. Aur. *Chron.* 3. 8. 144): The reading is unintelligible; see Drabkin's emendation, *TAPA*, LXXVI (1945), 316.

mundicina, -ae, 'tooth-powder' (Apul. *Carm.* frag. 2. 2): Delete entirely. Baehrens (*Fragm. poet. Lat.*—the reference must be got from the *Thesaurus*) drew the fragment from *Apol.* 6; hence it lies in the *Dictionary's* province; but the word exists only as an unnecessary emendation by Lipsius.

nenia 'carping criticism' (Hier. *Epist.* 57. 13. 1): This form of reference (see the Preface) implies that the word in this sense was known to Souter only in this place. But see *TAPA*, LXXIV (1943), 240–43; and note that the word is always plural in form when it has this meaning.

nubs . . . (... condemned by Serv. *Aen.* 1. 557): Read 587.

papula, 'nipple' (Cael. Aur. *Acut.* 2. 27. 143, etc.): Some other reference must be given to begin the series, for the word is senseless here, as Drabkin shows (p. 307).

paralleloe (nom. pl. παράλληλοι), 'lineal' (*Cens. frag.* 75.4): Read . . . παράλληλοι
lineae, 'parallel' (Ps. *Cens.* . . . 7. 4).

pellionarius . . . (*CIL* 6. 5. 482*): Read *pellionarius*.

poetes (ποιητής) = *poeta* (*CIL* 14. 2651): Dessau labels the inscription "aet. Augusti."

praesumptuosus . . . : The reference to Claud. Mam. *Anim.* p. 35. 3 belongs above under *praesumptiosus*.

puer, 'slave, servant' [saec. iv on]: This, as a "new" meaning, seems strange in view of Hor. *C.* 1. 38. 1 and other classical passages.

puerasco . . . (... Claud. Mam. *Anim.* p. 121. 11): Read 21. 11.

quarranta (= *quadraginta*) (*CIL* 13. 7645): The stone has *QARRANTA*, and the lemma should be printed *q(u)arranta*, to accord with

Souter's practice for indicating variant spellings in MSS.

racana ... (...CIL 13. 3162. 3, 11): Read 13. 3162. 2. 11.

sphaerista ... (...CIL 10. 6338 C 3. 15): Read 6838.

sposus = *sponsus* ...: The second word should carry the raised numeral 1, to distinguish it from *sponsus*² above, 'solemn promise'. It would have been helpful to supply meanings in the many cases (e. g., this one) where the form referred to will have to be found in the *Dictionary*.

squalor, 'obscurity' (Amm. 17. 1. 18...): Read 17. 1. 8.

tabosus ... (...AA 80 p. 573 A): What work is referred to I do not know.

tarundu minus (= ποταμογείτων ἕτερος), 'pondweed' (Diosc. 4. 99): Read Diosc. Vind. 4. 100; but here Wellmann's emendation ἄρουνδινάλης μίνορ is quite convincing. The entry can be removed; but note that in all these cases Souter is careful to give the reference: there is no danger that such entries will become the sort of "ghosts" that plague the users of Renaissance dictionaries.

taurobolium ...: The numerous references to *CIL* should read: 6. 497-99, 501-8, 510-12, 8. 23400, 23401, 9. 1540, 10. 1596, 14. 39.

transforatio, 'passage through (of bodily secretions)' (Cael. Aur. Chron. 1. 3. 56): Drabkin (311) reads *transvoratio*, with appropriate comment on Rouille's fanciful interpretation above.

Nevertheless, if the *Glossary* is not as serviceable or as systematic or as accurate as it could have been, it has at least appeared promptly—with amazing promptness, in fact, considering that it is mainly the work of one man. It has been an enormous labor, and the new material it contains will be of extraordinary help to any reader of Late Latin authors and to all students of the whole of Latinity. "The joy of discovering unrecorded words is perhaps even greater [than that of removing tralatitious blunders, i. e., "ghosts"], and of these there are thousands in this book that will not be found in any of the ordinary handbooks, and even a number that are not in the *Thesaurus* itself." The second part of this statement

(from the Preface, vi) is quite literally true, and its truth constitutes a fitting memorial to the late Professor Souter.⁵

JOHN L. HELLER

University of Illinois

Studien über φιλόλογος, φιλολογία und φιλολογεῖν. By GABRIËL R. F. M. NUCHELMANS. (Dissertation, University of Nijmegen.) Zwolle: N. V. Uitgevers-Maatschappij W. E. J. Tjeenk Willink, 1950. Pp. viii + 93.

The central part of this dissertation is an elaborate collection and discussion (pp. 11-58) of several hundred passages in which one or another of the three words (or the Latin equivalents *philologus* and *philologia*) occurs. The passages are arranged chronologically, by authors within successive centuries, from Plato to the fifth century after Christ. Since this arrangement necessarily leaves dangling certain questions of semantic development, of restrictions on usage and limitations in spread, these aspects are discussed in a separate chapter (pp. 59-74); see also the summary analysis of meanings (pp. 84-87), a short index of *iuxtaposita* (p. 88—to which ῥητορικὸς should be added, with a reference to pp. 30 and 56), and the *index locorum* (pp. 89-93). A useful chapter (pp. 75-83) is devoted to Φιλόλογος (*Philologus*) as a personal name.

Strict linguistic method, of course, demands that semantic development should be traced by means of minimum contrasts, with no more inference as to the meaning of the word in a particular context than is required by its associates in that place. The author disclaims any such treatment, and indeed his group of words offers no serious problems of semantic development. His method is rather to extract from each

5. Appreciations of Professor Souter have been published by the present editor of the *Dictionary*, Mr. J. M. Wylie, in *The Scottish Schoolmaster* for April, 1949, and by Mr. R. J. Getty in the *Aberdeen University Review* for Autumn, 1949. I am also much indebted to both scholars for information communicated by letter.

passage or group of passages a maximum of possible semantic content. His discussions and abundant cross-references will be useful to those who have to deal with these passages, and some of his suggestions are keen and not unimportant, for example that in Plut. *Vit. Pyrrh.* 8 the variant reading φιλόλογων is to be preferred to the usually accepted φιλοσοφῶν, which may be a correction due to the ban of the atticists on φιλόλογεῖν.

The work is not free from misprints, especially misplaced accents, but there are none that will cause great difficulty. By a more serious error, the author seems occasionally to confuse the thing denoted with the word itself. Thus on page 15 he criticizes Strabo for saying (2. 3. 7) that the Athenians were not φιλόλογοι by nature (φύσει), since on the basis of other passages (e.g., Plat. *Leg.* 641 E) the author has convinced himself that this quality was in fact a peculiarity native to Athenians; while on page 61 Seneca is censured for comparing and contrasting (*Ad Lucil.* 108. 30) the functions of *philologus*, *grammaticus*, and *philosophus*: "sind seine Bemerkungen dann auch schon deshalb nicht richtig, weil *grammaticus* und *philologus* keine gleichen Größen sind; die *grammatica* ist nur eine Spezies der *philologia*." It is clear from the author's useful list (p. 60f.) that the word φιλόλογος was in fact applied to people busy over a wide range of intellectual activities, but such an abstraction as this condemnation reveals belongs, let us say, rather to philosophy than to philology.

J. L. HELLER

University of Illinois

Lucians Kenntnis der Athenischen Antiquitäten. By JOSEF DELZ. (Dissertation, University of Basel, 1947.) Freiburg: Paulusdruckerei, 1950. Pp. viii+194.

Dr. Delz has done a laborious task very well. He has collected from Lucian and from Alciphron passages bearing on

Athenian public antiquities, classifying them into (a) learned references to classical conditions (correct and incorrect), and (b) indications of contemporary things, whether deliberately anachronistic, unconsciously anachronistic, or appropriate in the context. He makes a number of doubtful assumptions, which, fortunately, detract little from the usefulness of the book: (1) that Lucian was largely educated at Athens and lived there many years, (2) that Lucian's knowledge of contemporary Athenian institutions was full and correct (how many of us could describe accurately the government of cities we have lived in, even after a dozen years?), (3) that whenever Lucian uses an expression (e.g., χρηματίζειν, p. 126) which ever had a precise technical meaning at Athens, he is aware of that meaning. And yet it is characteristic of authors of this period to use ancient technical terms in a vague way.

Since he devotes several pages to discussing some ideas I once published on Lucian's use of decrees (in *TAPA*, LXXI [1940], 199ff.), I will take up those pages first, and then a number of points scattered through the book. On the theory of Asiatic origin of the spurious documents in *De corona*, which he believes (p. 135) to have been refuted by Schläpfer, I still agree with Treves in not finding Schläpfer convincing. On the formula εἶπε τὴν γνώμην, for which he finds a possible source in Thucydides (e.g., 8. 68. 1), it is still true, as I stated, that it does not occur in literature before Lucian. In Thucydides, as in the later writers cited by Swoboda (*Klio*, XVI [1919-20], 338), the phrase is γνώμην εἰπεῖν without any article. I still find no better explanation than the admittedly speculative theory of influence of Ephoros. Similarly, I said that ἀνὴρ καλὸς καγαθὸς does not occur in Attic honorary decrees; he cites *IG*, II², 1072, καλὸς καγαθὸς νεανίας, as if that were the same thing. I said ἀναστῆσαι is not found for στήσαι in Attic decrees, and he thinks he is refuting me with *IG*, II², 1072. 11 and 1106, where the forms are respectively

ἀνασταθῆναι and ἀνεστήσατε. In short, he talks about words where I was discussing formulas. Coining a phrase is always rare, and even when it happens, the new phrase follows a model—which in Lucian's case is more likely to be found in literature than in inscriptions.

On pages 8–12 he examines the use of demotics by Alciphron and Lucian. He concludes that since all occur in late inscriptions, this use may reflect contemporary Athens, which proves that Lucian and Alciphron may have lived there. But actually his data yield a more interesting conclusion. Each writer uses nine demotics, three of which are shared. The six which Lucian alone has are Acharnae, Marathon, Myrrhinous, Oenoe, Sounion and Phaleron. All but one of these are well known topographical names, places involved in history, conspicuous in the pages of Thucydides and Herodotus. The six which Alciphron has alone are Aexone, Cephisia, Paeania, Sphecttos, Phlya and Cholargos. These are demotics of some famous men, but not one is a place mentioned in Thucydides. I think we may safely conclude that both writers are archaizing, but that Lucian works from memory and uses famous names, while Alciphron digs up the adjectives.

Lucian's peculiar combination of demotic and tribe in official style (p. 18) is perhaps more likely taken from the opening of such biographies as the Aristophanic life of Aristophanes or the second life of Antiphon in Westermann, than due to the *miles gloriosus* character of New Comedy. The other possibility is contemporary use in other cities (e.g., Palmyra). The latter is probably the explanation for Lucian's giving tribes and phratries the main task of enrolling new citizens (15–19) rather than demes. Though ἡγωνοῦνται τὸ πέμπτον (p. 54, n. 3) does not occur in inscriptions, we do have ἀγωνοθέτης τὸ δεύτερον (*IGRR*, IV, 584) and frequently δις or τρις ἀγωνοθέτης, — once πεντάκις (*IGRR*, III, 739, IX, 30). On ὑπηρεταί (pp. 84–85) Alciphron was probably influenced by etymological dogma (cf. *Et. mag. s.v.*). The expression ἐξ

ἐφῆβων (p.92) seems to be commoner than Delz allows; cf. Ps-Plutarch *Mor.* 844 B (*Vit. Dem.* 3), Diogenes Laertius VI (*Crates*) 88, and the compound ἐξέφηβος in Censorinus (*Nat.* 14. 8). The proof that Alciphron lived in Athens because his metics come from Hermione and Pheneos, and three Athenian epitaphs of Hermionians and one of a Pheneate are extant, all from imperial times, is extremely weak. And we do know of at least one metic from Hermione in classical times—Lasos. The amount of exact verbal correspondence with Aeschines (p. 123; also ἀποδοθῆναι περὶ τούτων ἐκκλησίαι, p. 126 from Aeschines 2. 54; cf. Demosthenes 13. 3) makes it clear that Lucian's evidence at these points is not independent. In many cases (e.g., p. 124 on διανομαί, pp. 155–56 on appeals) Delz takes as evidence for contemporary Athens what is more likely attributable to some of the other cities in which Lucian had lived. The long etymological note on ἡρόν (pp. 130–31), besides being phonologically improbable, spoils the point of the passage in Lucian—the false gods must be sent back to their ἡρία, ordinary human graves, not Heroes' tombs, since they are mere mortals after all. Delz is unnecessarily troubled (e.g., p. 171) by the anachronisms in *Anacharsis*, which he assumes must have been deliberate. The truth seems to be that Lucian's aim was never to achieve a precisely correct historical background, but rather to avoid anything too obviously local or temporary and stick to generalities which would do equally well for 400 B.C. or A.D. 150, for Rome, Marseilles, or Antioch.

A convenient index of passages cited from the two authors and a useful subject-index close the volume.

FRED W. HOUSEHOLDER, JR.

Indiana University

Alexander der Große: Ingenium und Macht.

By FRITZ SCHACHERMEYER. Graz: Verlag Anton Pustet, 1949. Pp. 535 + 15 pls. + maps in text. \$1.10.

Every student of Alexander will have to read this interesting, full-length biography. Three hundred footnotes, gathered together at the end of the book and many of them rather extended, a substantial bibliography, and a goodly number of photographs and maps make this a serious and important contribution to the Alexander literature. The views of the Hindu Kush, with range piled on range, and of the desert wastes of Gedrosia emphasize vividly the difficulties met and overcome by Alexander.

Schachermeyr's book consists of eleven chapters, each subdivided into various sections. If this results in too detailed a presentation for the average reader, it does at least afford the author an opportunity to notice most of the incidents and problems connected with Alexander. For example, the perplexities of the Araxes-Jaxartes-Caspian-Tanais and of the Indus-Nile hypotheses are discussed and illustrated with sketch maps. The disadvantage of Schachermeyr's method is that, while noticing these problems, he is also writing a general biography and consequently must stop short of a full demonstration; an unavoidable ignorance of some of the modern literature adds to the difficulties. For example, how is one to handle Schachermeyr's discussion of Alexander's last plans? Several pages are devoted to them, complete with a sketch map and dotted lines and arrows showing Alexander's scheme to march across North Africa, perhaps through Spain and over the Pyrenees and Alps into Italy; and other dots show a possible exploration of the Caspian as far as that Ocean which rings the earth. It all stems from Wilcken, and a footnote seemingly surveys the modern literature. Tarn is swept away in a sentence, though there can hardly be any doubt that he has conclusively shown Alexander's so-called *Memoirs*, as preserved in Diodorus, to be false. But the problem does not end there: though Diodorus is no evidence and these particular plans accordingly never existed, I believe, as opposed to Tarn, that Alex-

ander did nevertheless plan a western expedition. I have tried to indicate that a book of this size, touching on many problems with just enough discussion to suggest finality, cannot be adequately reviewed in a few hundred words.

Schachermeyr's commendable attempt to present Alexander "schonungslos" is accompanied by a willingness to accept less reputable stories about him; care must be rigidly exercised as much on one side of this subject as the other. He gives us the complex nature of Alexander: lover of romance and adventure, dreamer, military genius. Beginning with a determination to free himself from the controls of the feudal nobility, Alexander evolved the dream of a dictatorial world state—an autocratic welfare state—and was willing to use brute force to bring it into being. His task, says Schachermeyr, was to resolve the conflict between the state's authority and human freedom. This, the toughest and most important problem connected with Alexander, consists really of two parts, and I should like to devote my remaining space to it.

In the first place, there is the question of Alexander's insistence on universalism, or co-operation between peoples, or dream of the brotherhood of man—call it what one will. Tarn (*Proceedings of the British Academy*, XIX [1933]) first developed the subject and argued it in connection with the mutiny and subsequent banquet and prayer at Opis in the year before Alexander's death. I have examined it (*Hesperia*, Supplement VIII [1949], pp. 299ff.) from an entirely different angle: a factual¹ recitation of certain deeds of Alexander as far as Bactria-Sogdiana (thus avoiding difficulties in the sources at the end of Alexander's life). If these do not add up to universalism (or co-operation, etc.), it would be interesting to know what label is to be applied; in any case, the deeds must be part of any addition.²

1. My distinguished friend, C. B. Welles, says that I out-Tarn Tarn (*Gnomon*, XXII [1950], 53), though I have steered clear of prayers and, moreover, differ with Tarn on almost every important point concerning Alexander.

2. No one has ever suggested, except in vague general-

If we may take it as certain, for the sake of argument, that Alexander did have hold of a great idea, we then are faced with our second problem. How was this idea to be brought into being? Autocratically, says Schachermeyr. He is too competent a historian, however, to brush off the idea glibly, as does MacKendrick (*AJA*, LIII [1949], 89), on the ground that not even in our day can it be attained "except by submission to the unchallenged rule of a world conqueror."

A measure of the worth of Schachermeyr's work is the stimulation it will give to further study of Alexander. Surely writing "in schwerer Zeit," Schachermeyr is to be congratulated warmly on the result.

C. A. ROBINSON, JR.

Brown University

Ilias Atheniensium: The Athenian Iliad of the Sixth Century B.C. Edited by GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING. (Special Publication of the American Philological Association with the co-operation of the Linguistic Society of America, ed. JOHN L. HELLER.) Lancaster: Lancaster Press Inc., 1950. Pp. x+18 + text. Order through agents of association.

This distinguished book represents an important further step in a task to which Bolling has devoted nearly half a century. As a preliminary to this edition he has published a large number of journal articles, and two books: *The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Oxford, 1925) and *The Athetized Lines of the Iliad* (Baltimore, 1944). On the basis of these earlier works Bolling here presents

his reconstruction of II, "a manuscript written in Athens in the sixth century" and "the sole source of all our knowledge of the *Iliad*."

Bolling long ago developed certain basic beliefs about the transmission of the Homeric text. They were carefully described and defended in the first part of his *Athetized Lines*, and they are the governing principles of the present edition of the *Iliad*. The most important of them are a deep faith in the atheteses of the Alexandrian Homerists (a faith resting on the conviction that these scholars' atheteses were always motivated by manuscript evidence), and the postulate that in attempting to reconstitute II one must prefer the shorter text. "When a passage is known to have stood in one text and to have been absent from another, or when such a condition can be inferred, the difference—provided it has not been produced by some accidental blunder—has been brought about by expansion, not by contraction of the text. The verses in question must therefore be put not into the text of II, but into a critical commentary." These principles and the arguments against them have long been familiar to Homerists, and there seems no point in discussing them again at this time. Many will, I am sure, continue to question the validity of at least some of the postulates which have guided Bolling in his work, but Homerists generally should be pleased that he has found the time and energy to produce this concrete evidence of the following out of these postulates.

The average Homerist will, I am afraid, feel as he reads over some of the pages of Bolling's *Iliad* that he is looking upon a rather sadly distorted image of an old friend. He will probably, however, feel compelled to admit that possibly his old friend actually did look somewhat like that in his younger days; so great is our ignorance about the origin and transmission of these poems. Some of Bolling's excisions certainly have, to say the least, little intrinsic probability. For instance,

izations, what led Alexander in the first place to envisage co-operation between peoples. Whatever the reason, it must have been simple and direct, rather than philosophical; the explanation, that is to say, must have a clear ring to it, in the sense, for example, of military necessity. In the second volume of the forthcoming David Robinson *Featechrift* I argue that the revolt and dismissal of Alexander's famous Thessalian cavalry (on the frontier of Bactria, where his imperial ideas immediately began to blossom) left Alexander short of troops and forced him into co-operation with the barbarian world.

Bolling relegates to his critical commentary the opening nine lines of Achilles' speech in Book 1. 225ff. because they were athetized by Zenodotus. But after Athena has urged Achilles to insult (*ὀνειδίσσον*) Agamemnon, it is surely anticlimactic for Achilles to say only, in effect, "I swear by this scepter you will feel sorry some day for the way you have treated me." In his *Athetized Lines* (p.58), after praising the quality of the athetized passage and recognizing the possibility that its omission by some of Zenodotus' manuscripts was merely a blunder (but not, of course, recognizing that Zenodotus or someone else may well have objected to the lines for purely subjective reasons), Bolling concluded his discussion by saying, "It is quite possible that an interpolator added 225-33 in order that Athena's *ὀνειδίσσον* may be fulfilled by this outburst of abuse." Surely I am not alone in feeling that it is far more likely that the poet who had Athena tell Achilles to insult Agamemnon then had Achilles follow her advice.

An important point of difference between this book and Bolling's two earlier books is that here he does not confine himself to the problem of reconstituting the lines of II, but has undertaken "to attempt to restore the wording as well as the lines of the sixth-century text, even though . . . the attempt could at best be successful only at points." This means, of course, that this edition of the *Iliad* is considerably more than the text which was merely described and discussed in *Athetized Lines*. On the value and soundness of many of the readings in Bolling's new edition only a linguist can speak. Some of them have a strong attraction, however, even for the innocent; I think, for instance, of his method of getting rid of the troublesome *τά* in line 125 of the first book. Few, if any, readers will be much concerned about some anachronisms which, Bolling remarks, have been forced upon his text by practical, i.e., financial, considerations. After all, anyone who is prepared to accept as "The Athenian *Iliad* of the Sixth

Century" a book in codex form printed from movable types on paper of twentieth-century manufacture can readily swallow such gnats as division into books and the use of printed accents.

One highly important and thoroughly sound position which Bolling maintains in his "Introduction" (as he has previously maintained elsewhere) is that an editor of the *Iliad* should as far as possible attempt to reproduce such a text as may have existed at some particular time and place in the long history of the written tradition of the poems. It was natural that, as successive bits of information about the history of the Greek language were rediscovered after Bentley's resurrection of the digamma, editors of Homer should have been inspired to introduce into their texts whenever possible these fascinating new symbols of learning and antiquity. It was also natural that they did not seem concerned because what they were producing was a text which could never have existed at any time and place in antiquity, compounded as it was of a basically late matrix into which editors embedded these rediscovered early crystals. And the fact that the crystals occasionally later proved to be synthetic counterfeits did not improve these texts.

No one with the slightest familiarity with the wavering, not to say erratic, course of Homeric scholarship in the last hundred years would be bold enough to predict what the attitude of the Homerists of the twenty-first century will be to this edition of the *Iliad* (if, indeed, the world is to be granted a twenty-first century). I think it is conceivable they may regard it as an important step towards the recovery of the true *Iliad* of Homer. But I think it is also possible that by then it may have joined on the Homerists' shelves such books as Payne Knight's edition, Koehly's *Iliadis Carmina XVI*, and Fick's Aeolic Homer and be looked upon as one of the curiosities of Homeric scholarship. But in proportion as its treatment of the vulgate is less violent than the treatment in those books it may be re-

garded with more respect, or at least with more indulgence.

A most praiseworthy feature of the book is the way in which the vast difficulties of printing it have been surmounted. The Oxford Classical Text formed the basis of this edition, which was lithoprinted from it, but a large amount of rearranging, modification, and addition was necessary. This new material was set up in type by the University of Chicago Press. When the method to be followed was first announced I, and I suspect many others, felt great qualms about the result. But the general impression which the book makes is neat and pleasing. Defects I have noted are minor: it is a little unfortunate that the Greek type used by the University of Chicago Press does not quite match the Oxford type; now and then there is too large a space between lines of the text when one of the lines was at the bottom of the Oxford page. Misprints, even omitted or erroneous accents, are incredibly few; "Moellendorf" page 11, note 25; "possessive" page 15, line 6 from bottom; a word omitted from the critical note on Book 10, 159a. This is surely one of the most carefully edited and accurately printed scholarly works recently produced in this country. The Editor of the American Philological Association, John L. Heller, and all the craftsmen who worked on the book deserve the thanks and admiration of all who will use it.

FREDERICK M. COMBELLACK

University of Oregon

The Aeolus Episode and Greek Wind Magic.

By REINHOLD STRÖMBERG. ("Acta Universitatis Gotoburgensis," LVI [1950], 3, pp. 73-84.) Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag, 1950. Pp. 16. Kr. 2.

Probably we all share with Vergil the idea that Aeolus was a picturesque character. No one knows exactly where his realm was supposed to be, but for me it is satisfying (even if unscholarly) to accept

the tradition that it was Stromboli ("the lighthouse of the Mediterranean").

In the first pages of this article Professor Strömberg calls attention to the prominent folklore elements in the Aeolus story as told by Homer at the beginning of Book 10 of the *Odyssey*. The island that Ulysses reached floated and was encompassed by a bronze wall; the sack of the winds, which was made from the hide of a nine-year-old ox, was tied with a silver cord; and when Ulysses left the island he sailed nine days and nine nights before misadventure overtook him. These aspects of the story give Strömberg opportunity to cite the literature on the lore of floating islands, bronze walls, hides, silver, and the number nine.¹ One might add that Aeolus is called Hippotades, which reminds us that in folklore it is a slow horse that is not as fast as the winds.

An obvious motif of the story, curiosity, is not mentioned, probably because it is such a commonplace. The myth of Pandora provides a good example of it, as do dozens of modern folk tales in which persons are given the run of spacious castles except for one room, which they are forbidden to open. Their curiosity inevitably gets the better of them, and they enter the forbidden chambers, to their own undoing.

After giving references to various stories that have to do with bags and wind magic, Strömberg concludes that they are too widespread and too diversified to have had a common source or a single place of origin. He thinks that Homer made use of an old popular belief about wind magic.

A friend of Strömberg's called his attention to the fact that primitive peoples use inflated skins to cross rivers. With this idea in mind Strömberg cautiously makes the following suggestion (p. 81): "The belief of the primitive that such an in-

1. A reference worth noting in connection with Homeric folklore in general is Ernst Samter, *Volkskunde im altsprachlichen Unterricht*, Teil I: *Homer* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1923). Unfortunately this valuable book was printed on very cheap paper, and my copy is already dilapidated. It ages ten years annually.

flated sack could possess a magic power may have arisen from the force with which the sack rose above the water if it was pressed down under the surface." In my opinion folktales are too naïve and spontaneous to make this ingenious idea very plausible. Storytellers would naturally put the winds in receptacles which they had been accustomed to use for other purposes and which had an opening that could be tightly closed. In India winds and rains were kept under control in two jars.² It does not seem necessary, therefore, to ascribe any special magical properties to the sack itself, even though such powers are sometimes attributed to hides of animals.

Readers interested in Aeolus would do well to consult an article by Professor Campbell Bonner, "Aeolus Figured on Colic Amulets," *The Harvard Theological Review*, XXXV (April, 1942), 87-93.³

Professor Strömberg's brochure is very readable, and it is one that can be enjoyed by persons of wide interests who have had no special training in the classics. It is good to have periodic résumés of the literature on various subjects.

EUGENE S. MCCARTNEY

University of Michigan

Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, 3. Teil: *Geschichte von Städten und Völkern (Horographie und Ethnographie)*, B: *Autoren über einzelne Städte (Länder)*, Nr. 297-607. By FELIX JACOBY. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1950. Pp. 8 + 779. \$13.50.

This volume of Jacoby's collection — *F.Gr.Hist.* IIIB for short — contains the text of the fragments only. Professor Jacoby says in his preface that the manuscript of the commentary (Vol. IIb) is finished and also a special supplementary

volume, written in English, which will be a more detailed commentary on the local historians of Athens and form a companion volume to his recently published *Atthis* (Oxford, 1949).

Since there is so much to come, it seems best to postpone full discussion until at least one of these other books appears. For the present it must be enough to say that there are 310 Greek local historians represented in this volume, arranged in alphabetical order of cities or countries (Achaia-Troizen); the next volume of text (IIIC) will contain ethnographers (Ägypten-Thrakien). There is a great deal of interesting material here. There are the *Atthides*, with the many new fragments that were not in Müller's *Fragmenta*; there are the Sicilian histories of Antiochus and Timaeus and the epigraphical *Chronicle of Lindos*; and some people will be surprised to find eighteen distinct historians of Sparta, who are not by any means all mere names.

LIONEL PEARSON

Stanford University

Callimachus, Vol. I: *Fragmenta*. Edited by RUDOLF PFEIFFER. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1949. Pp. xiv + 520. \$13.00.

"How," asks a writer in a recent English weekly, "can one review an encyclopaedia except by setting up a second encyclopaedia in its place?" That question fairly represents the perplexity of one who undertakes a notice of the present volume. With the editor's approval I refrain from attempting anything that could be called a review, and offer a mere report of the plan, method, and contents of the book.

Professor Pfeiffer's supremacy in the study of Callimachus will scarcely be disputed, and his material, though it consists only of fragments, is monumental because of the bulk of writing that has accumulated about these scanty remains. With this immense mass the editor has dealt faithfully and carefully. Every one of the 825

2. Philostratus *Vita Apollonii* 3. 14.

3. See also Professor Bonner's *Studies in Magical Amulets, Chiefly Graeco-Egyptian* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1950), pp. 65-66.

fragments in this volume, many of them consisting of only a word or two, or even of a mere allusion by some other writer to a statement of the poet, is provided with all the information upon which an understanding of it can be based. That information consists of many items: the source, whether one or more pieces of papyrus, or a passage in an ancient author, which is regularly quoted fully enough to exhibit the context in which the fragment occurs — truly a boon to the reader; critical and paleographical notes on the fragment itself; references to earlier emendations or interpretations of the text, with brief statements of the editor's own opinions; concise discussion of the places in Callimachus' work to which the unlabelled fragments may be assigned; and references to previous writings that have dealt with the pieces under consideration.

That would be enough to make a large and very useful book; but the editor has been still more generous, citing many similar passages in earlier or later authors, indicating sources upon which Callimachus drew and imitations by writers who came after him, and making many important contributions to the exegesis of this mannered and sometimes obscure poet. It is no exaggeration to say that in this book, or with its help, the student can find virtually all that is essential, or at any rate all that sound scholarship has hitherto provided, for the understanding of the works here represented. To read carefully through the *apparatus* under even one of the more important fragments is to feel as if one were carried back across half a century and were sitting in a seminar of Johannes Vahlen's; so meticulously and conscientiously is every problem faced and every difficulty treated.

About a third of the volume is occupied by the *Aitia*, first the pieces that can be definitely or probably assigned to one of the four books, then the fragments that cannot be so placed. (In Bk. 4 the student of Catullus will be grateful to find No. 66 confronted with the remains of the original *Coma Berenices*, which include three

hitherto unpublished fragments.) Then follow the remnants, in some instances fairly extensive, of thirteen *Iambi* — not all in iambic trimeter, several being choliambic, one a trochaic trimeter (or acephalous iambic), while there are still other patterns and combinations. For these poems the discovery of the *Diegeseis* gives us the order, the first lines (as lemmata), and very scanty indications of the contents. Next come fragments of four poems, three of which have special titles — *Night Festival*, *Branchos*, *Deification of Arsinoe*. Gallavotti, who edited the *Iambi* in 1946, grouped these four pieces with the iambic poems; Pfeiffer classes them, somewhat hesitatingly, as μέλη, because the meters are lyric and because Suidas attributes lyric poems to Callimachus.

Next follow the numerous but pitifully meager relics of the *Hecale*. It is noteworthy that while our knowledge of the *Aitia* and the *Iambi* has been considerably enlarged by papyrus texts, we are less fortunate in the case of the epyllion. The lines that Gomperz published almost sixty years ago from a wooden tablet in the Archduke Rainer's collection are still the largest and most important relic; they have been only slightly reinforced by additions from papyri in Oxford and Florence.

In the next group, fragments of minor epic and elegiac poems and of epigrams, the most important is the poem on the victory of Sosibius, known since 1922 from *P Oxy.*, 1793, and now augmented at the beginning by an unpublished Oxyrhynchus fragment. Some twenty-five pages are given over to the fragments of Callimachus' works in various departments of learning (*Fragmenta grammatica*). There are over two hundred and fifty other fragments of unknown location, and almost one hundred that can be assigned to Callimachus only doubtfully. The list closes with a few *spuria* and *delenda*. The last pages of the volume are occupied by a rather long list of *Addenda et Corrigenda*, and various tables which facilitate the comparison of this edition with previous ones, and enable

one to find the places in the volume to which the numerous papyri have been assigned.

Despite the imposing bulk of this work, its editor would probably be the last to claim that it is definitive. (Note as examples of his candid self-correction p. 22, Frag. 13, and p. 31, middle.) Already Barber and Maas have published two ingenious improvements (*CQ*, XLIV [1950], 96), and still more recently a small papyrus in the Michigan collection has been identified as a part of *Iambus* 12, where it makes possible an almost complete restoration of lines 56-70. Other minor amendments and accretions may be expected, but it will be many years before anybody is likely to face the formidable task of another edition.

No review can give an adequate idea of the patience and skill with which Professor Pfeiffer has applied the resources of his own broad learning and that of other experts to the work of making the great Alexandrian more intelligible and more significant to the average scholar. That is not to say that an attentive reader may not detect a trivial fault here and there. There seems to be a false reference in the last line but one of page 204. The note on ἀστυον in Frag. 43. 76 might well have been placed earlier (at Frag. 11. 5). While the illustrative comment is necessarily selective, one misses something now and then. In any group of references to the miraculous power of a divine hand (note on Frag. 7. 13f.) one expects to find Hdt. 6. 61, the story of Helen stroking the ugly baby. At Frag. 43. 68, one misses Xen. *Anab.* 5. 4. 26, the earliest example of the word μόνον; and the rarity of ἀναστροφὴν (Frag. 196. 45) would justify a reference to Hdt. 5. 31. But mentioning such trifles is like brushing a little dust off the corner of a stately edifice.

The observant reader will join the editor (*Praef.*, p. ix) in paying a high tribute to the skill and learning displayed by Mr. Lobel in the reading and placing of desperately damaged fragments of papyrus.

The Delegates of the Clarendon Press

deserve great praise for their liberality in undertaking to publish so complex a work, as also for the accuracy of the printing and the fine appearance of the book. The second volume, which is to contain the *Hymns* and *Epigrams*, and also prolegomena and indexes for the whole work, will be eagerly awaited by the learned world.

CAMPBELL BONNER

Ann Arbor, Michigan

L'Ostracismo. By ARISTIDE CALDERINI. ("Res Gestae," Raccolta di studi storici diretta da Aristide Calderini; Dott. Carlo Marzorati-Editore.) Como, 1945. Pp. 132.

This is one of the best essays on Athenian ostracism, written by a great scholar whose special field lies, however, in Roman studies. Calderini's book does not pretend to be a new and exhaustive treatment of a subject to which J. Carcopino has devoted his well known work *L'Ostracisme Athénien* (Alcan, 1935, in second edition) and about which O. Reinmuth has written the competent *RE* article (1942). Calderini follows Carcopino in general, thus giving the Italian reader a shorter but not essentially different version of the French book. For the purposes of this review, only the more original contributions made by Calderini will be stressed.

After several brief chapters dealing with the historical background of the Cleisthenian reforms and with the reforms themselves, including ostracism, Calderini enters the discussion of the procedure (chap. V) by setting the operation of the law of ostracism against the background of the traditional laws against tyranny (pp. 31-33). Later on (chap. VII), he calls our attention to the late fifth century measures against the overthrow of democracy (pp. 72-79). In this way, Calderini indicates the proper historical position of ostracism, as I have elaborated in a note in *AJA*, LV (1951), 221 ff.

Calderini argues (pp. 37-39) that ostra-

cism operated with a *quorum* of 6000 but that it was not necessary for the "successful" candidate to collect at least 6000 votes. I agree with him and should like to add that Philochorus (Frag. 79b, repeated almost word for word in Schol. Aristophanes *Equ.* 855, a passage now noted by Jacoby Frag. 30, note) may have said the same thing. The two steps described by Plutarch (*Aristides* 7.7-8) consist of a preliminary count to determine whether the required *quorum* of 6000 votes had been cast, and in a special count, if the first was satisfactory, to determine the individual to be ostracized.¹ These same two steps seem to be referred to by Philochorus (διαριθμηθέντων δὲ ὅτω [or ὧν] πλείστα γένοιτο καὶ μὴ ἐλάττω ἐξακισχιλίων abbreviated and confused in Pollux 8.10: ὅτω δὲ ἐξακισχίλια γένοιτο τὰ ὀστρακα) who listed them, however, in the reverse order; his original text may have been fuller and clearer. To assume either that one needed more than 6000 votes to be exiled or that Philochorus (and his source Androtion) thought so is more difficult than to reconcile the accounts of Plutarch (perhaps Theophrastus; see *TAPA*, LXXIX [1948], 210) and Philochorus.

The most informative chapter is devoted to "the concrete cases of ostracism" (chap. VI) in which Calderini differs considerably from Carcopino whose *ostracisés imaginaires* occupy almost as much space as the *victimes réelles*. But Calderini's list on page 46 must be checked against the exemplary concordance now presented by Vanderpool (*Hesperia*, Suppl. 8). The treatment of the individual cases is rather disappointing because one feels that the author is not intimately familiar with the peculiar problems of fifth century Attic history; for the ostracism of Hyperbolus (chap. VII), I may refer to my own comments on the subject, *TAPA*, LXXIX (1948). Yet one cannot but agree with Calderini's general conclusions (pp. 63-68)

1. One should not object that the contest may have been close and that only a few votes may have determined who was to be exiled and who was not; the outcome of our presidential elections is often close, and the very principle of voting makes such occurrences inevitable.

which emphasize the shortcomings of ostracism as well as the contribution it made to the conduct of Attic policy at home and abroad.

A final chapter is devoted to critical estimates of ostracism, especially by Aristotle and Paolo Paruta (1540-98); one regrets that these fine observations are not carried on to include, in greater detail, other authors, for instance G. Grote.

Especial praise must be given to the Appendix containing what amounts to a complete account of the literary evidence, printed for the most part in the original Greek; the only passage I missed was Aristides 46.158. Although printed errors are frequent (as elsewhere in the book), and no attempt is made to relate the passages to each other, this collection of primary evidence alone makes Calderini's book particularly valuable.

A. E. RAUBITSCHKE

Princeton University

Einführung in die griechische Metrik. By KARL RUPPRECHT. 3d ed. fully rev. München: Max Hueber Verlag, 1950. Pp. 109. DM 5.80.

In this well-printed, paper-backed volume Professor Rupprecht presents a third, reworked edition of his *Introduction to Greek Metrics*. The foreword contains two extracts, chiefly of acknowledgment, from the prefaces to the two previous editions, followed by a brief preface to this edition, in which the author observes that the book has been expanded, mainly by a more complete consideration of lyric meters, particularly Pindar, to satisfy the needs of university students in addition to those of school students, to whom the previous editions were primarily addressed. Since the book is designed for beginners, the verse schemata are given as simply as possible and matters still unproved or in doubt are avoided.

After a brief bibliography the author divides his book into two sections: basic

principles and verse measures. The first part treats in a short and elementary form of quantity, the nature of, and reasons for, long and short syllables, metrical terms such as elision, aphaeresis, apocope, etc. and ends with a short description of metrical foot and the triadic form.

The second part forms the bulk and the meat of the book. The measures dealt with are dactyl and anapaest, iambus and trochee, ionic, choriambic dimeter, dochmius, dactylo-epitrite etc., and the paeon and bacchius. The treatment is descriptive rather than historical and in each case the method tends to be the same: a description of the foot, of possible substitutions or variations, examples of verse-lines or stanzas in which the respective feet are used, comments and rules of scansion. For example, all the variations of dactylic hexameter known to antiquity (a total of thirty-two) are illustrated from Homer (a reviewer of a previous edition rightly questioned whether such a list was really necessary); again, familiar stanzas from the dramatists and lyric poets are spelt out line by line, with the appropriate scansion marks and abbreviated descriptions of each foot. Examples are quoted in very great numbers from a wide range of authors and the comments on them, though usually short, are given in considerable detail; the rules of scansion are sometimes derived from the examples themselves and at other times (when they are printed in spaced letters) are quoted from authorities such as Maas and Meyer.

The book ends with indexes of abbreviations, quotations, subjects and modern authors. There is an appendix on the ten-syllable Alcaic line, which is largely a series of rules and references, and a brief list of addenda.

The limitations of the book are perhaps unavoidable. Greek metrics, particularly choral meters, are notoriously difficult and to reduce them to a handbook of 109 pages, which is both clear and well-arranged, is a considerable task. There is little room for argument or discussion and, save for Porson's law, almost no reference outside

German scholarship. The book sometimes gives an appearance of dogmatism, although the author is occasionally aware of alternative possibilities of scansion, e.g., on page 62. These limitations may, in fact, render the book less valuable for university students, while its detail would seem to go beyond the scope of most schoolboys.

Finally, while misprints are few (e.g., $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\delta\epsilon$ for $\tau\acute{\omicron}\delta\epsilon$ p. 10, $\Delta\iota\delta\epsilon$ for $\Delta\iota\delta\epsilon$ p. 27, $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ for $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ p. 63), the system of abbreviation is at times maddening. Obviously the author found this a difficult problem, for he is at pains to explain his own abbreviations and to give an index of the other ones which he uses. But if he had spelt out at least those abbreviations that occur in the body of the text, though the book would have been larger, he would have avoided such indigestible sentences as that on page 26: "Auf einen dakt. dim. + dakt. m. (21) folgt ein akat. iamb. dim. (37) (der Stollen), auf einen dakt. dim. + dakt. m. ein enhopl. (30) (der Gegenstollen)."

JOHN G. HAWTHORNE

University of Chicago

The Symbolism of the House Door in Classical Poetry. By ELIZABETH HAZELTON HAIGHT. New York and Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co., 1950. Pp. xii + 158. \$3.00.

The scope and method of this study can best be appreciated by examining first the words with which Professor Haight introduces her conclusions (p. 147):

Out of the studies about the symbolism of the door in the various chapters of this book certain facts have emerged. The symbol of the door is persistently recurrent; its meanings are simple and repetitive. The first and foremost is the symbol of sex-love, for the door of maidenhood, which must be forced, for the door of the home, which must be built and protected. So the door may stand for all the integrity of family life, for the hospitality of the house, or for the violation of hospitality from without or from within: the door opened, the door closed. And out of this

imagery there develops a conception of a new world in which women take their parts not only in the social structure, but in the political as well.

An initial chapter makes clear the universality of the door-motif in literature and illustrates the meaning of symbolism through Cassirer and Jung, Panofsky and Bowra. In the following chapters the use of the door is examined in Greek tragedy, Aristophanes, Plautus, Theocritus, the Greek Anthology, and the Latin elegiac poets. In Greek tragedy the stage is set with Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* where action before and behind the palace door illuminates the tragedy; the door's effectiveness is further elaborated in Sophocles and Euripides. In Aristophanes Professor Haight is concerned not so much with the functional doors of drama as with motifs

like escape and chastity that may involve doors. It is in the Latin poets and their Greek contemporaries that the door comes into its (symbolic) own as an element in domestic comedy and amatory addresses. Of these poets Professor Haight writes (p. 117): "The symbolism of the door, which is common to them all, offers a key to unlock their hearts."

The house-door serves in this book to bring together Greek and Latin poets with general notes and comments on their lives and works. The extent to which their doors are symbols and not just doors is overstated, but the juxtaposition of poets and collection of passages make pleasant reading.

MABEL LANG

Bryn Mawr College

BOOKS RECEIVED

[Not all works submitted can be reviewed, but those that are sent to the editorial office for notice are regularly listed under "Books Received." Offprints from periodicals and parts of books will not be listed unless they are published (sold) separately. Books submitted are not returnable.]

- Actes du premier Congrès de la Fédération Internationale des Associations d'Études Classiques à Paris, 28 août—2 septembre, 1950.* Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1951. Pp. 405.
- ALEXANDER, WILLIAM HARDY. *Maïus opus (Aeneid 7-12)*. ("University of California Publications in Classical Philology," Vol. XIV, No. 5, pp. 193-214.) Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1951. \$0.25.
- _____. *The Religion of Classicism*. Reprinted from the "Proceedings of the Royal Society of Canada," Ser. III, Vol. XLV (June, 1951), pp. 125-40.
- ALFÖLDI, ANDREW. *A Conflict of Ideas in the Late Roman Empire: The Clash between the Senate and Valentinian I*. Translated by HAROLD MATTINGLY. New York: Oxford University Press, 1952. Pp. viii + 151. \$3.75.
- Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa: Lettere, Storia e Filosofia*, Ser. II, Vol. XX (1951), Fasc. 1-2. Firenze: "La nuova Italia" Editrice, 1951. L. 2000 a year (4 nos.).
- BALDRY, H. C. *Greek Literature for the Modern Reader*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1951. Pp. ix + 321. \$3.75.
- BARDON, HENRY. *La littérature latine inconnue*, Vol. I: *L'époque républicaine*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1952. Pp. 382. Fr. 1600.
- BARON, SALO WITTMAYER. *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, Vols. I and II: *Ancient Times*. 2d ed. rev. and enl. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952. Pp. xii + 415 + 493. \$12.50.
- COLEMAN-NORTON, P. R. (ed.). *Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honor of Allan Chester Johnson*. Edited with the assistance of F. C. BOURNE and J. V. A. FINE. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1951. Pp. xiv + 373. \$5.00.
- CROUZET, PAUL. *Nouvelle grammaire latine simple et complète*. Toulouse: Édouard Privat; Paris: Marcel Didier, 1951. Pp. xx + 150.
- CROUZET, P. and BERTHET, G. *Nouvelle méthode latine et exercices illustrés*. Toulouse: Édouard Privat; Paris: Marcel Didier, 1951. Pp. xxiv + 391 + 67 ills.
- CROON, JOH. H. *The Herdsman of the Dead: Studies on some Cults, Myths and Legends of the Ancient Greek Colonization-Area*. Utrecht: Boekhandel H. De Vroede, 1952. Pp. x + 112. 12s. 6d.
- DAMON, P. W., and HELMBOLD, W. C. *The Structure of Propertius, Book 2*. ("University of California Publications in Classical Philology," Vol. XIV, No. 6, pp. 215-54.) Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1952.
- DELEBECQUE, ÉDOUARD. *Euripide et la Guerre du Péloponnèse*. ("Études et Commentaires," No. X.) Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1951. Pp. 489.
- DUCKWORTH, GEORGE E. *The Nature of Roman Comedy: A Study in Popular Entertainment*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1952. Pp. xvi + 501 + 8 pls. \$7.50.
- GRANT, MICHAEL. *Ancient History*. ("Home Study Books," ed. B. IFOR EVANS.) London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1952. Pp. viii + 247 + 5 maps. 7s. 6d.
- HACKFORTH, R. (ed. and trans.). *Plato's Phaedrus, Translated with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1952. Pp. x + 172. \$3.75.
- HAKAMIES, REINO. *Étude sur l'origine et l'évolution du diminutif latin et sa survie dans les langues romanes*. ("Annales Academiæ scientiarum Fennicæ," Ser. B, Tom. 71, 1.) Helsinki, 1951. Pp. 148. Mk. 4.00.
- HANFMANN, GEORGE M. A. *The Season Sarcophagus in Dumbarton Oaks*. 2 vols. ("Dumbarton Oaks Studies," No. II.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951. Pp. viii + 280; xxii + 238 + 150 ills. \$25.00.
- JANÁČEK, KAREL. *Prolegomena to Sextus Empiricus*. ("Acta Universitatis Palackianæ Olomucensis," No. 4.) Olomouc: Nákladem Palackého University. Pp. 64.
- JONES, W. H. S. (trans.). *Pliny: Natural History*. In 10 vols. Vol. VI: *Books 20-23*. ("Loeb Classical Library," No. 392.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951. Pp. xxvi + 532. \$3.00.

- LAIDLAW, W. A. *Latin Literature*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. Pp. 229. \$2.75.
- LEVY, REUBEN. *The Persian Language*. ("Hutchinson's University Library: Modern Languages," ed. N. B. JOPSON.) New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. Pp. 125. \$5.75.
- LINFORTH, IVAN M. *Religion and Drama in "Oedipus at Colonus"*. ("University of California Publications in Classical Philology," Vol. XIV, No. 4, pp. 75-192.) Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1951. \$1.25.
- MAZZARINO, SANTO. *Aspetti sociali del quarto secolo: Ricerche di storia tardo-romana*. ("Problemi e ricerche di storia antica," No. 1.) Roma: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, 1951. Pp. 441. L. 4000.
- Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, Vol. XX. Rome: American Academy in Rome, 1951. Pp. 166 + 3 pls.
- MICHELL, H. *Sparta*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1952. Pp. x + 348. \$7.00.
- PAGE, DENYS L. *Alcman: The Partheneion*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1951. Pp. xii + 179. \$4.25.
- PARSONS, EDWARD ALEXANDER. *The Alexandrian Library, Glory of the Hellenic World: Its Rise, Antiquities, and Destrutions*. Amsterdam; London; New York: The Elsevier Press, 1952. Pp. xiv + 468 + 6 pls. + 6 maps. \$7.50.
- PERRY, BEN EDWIN (ed. and trans.). *Aesopica: A Series of Texts Relating to Aesop or Ascribed to him or Closely Connected with the Literary Tradition that Bears his Name*, Vol. I: *Greek and Latin Texts*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1952. Pp. xxvi + 765. \$15.00 (cloth).
- PHARR, CLYDE (ed. and trans.). *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions: A Translation with Commentary, Glossary, and Bibliography*. In collaboration with THERESA SHERRER DAVIDSON and MARY BROWN PHARR. With an Introduction by C. DICKERMAN WILLIAMS. ("The Corpus of Roman Law," Vol. I.) Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1952. Pp. xxvi + 643 + map. \$20.00.
- Revista de educación*, Vol. XI, No. 58 (December, 1951). Santiago de Chile: Ministerio de educación pública de Chile, 1951.
- RICHTER, GISELA M. A. *Three Critical Periods in Greek Sculpture*. (Lectures delivered at the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, Harvard University, 28, 30 March, and 1 April 1949.) New York: Oxford University Press, 1951. Pp. xii + 142 + figs. \$5.00.
- ROBBINS, EDWIN W. *Dramatic Characterization in Printed Commentaries on Terence, 1473-1600*. ("Illinois Studies in Language and Literature," Vol. XXXV, No. 4.) Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1951. Pp. x + 122. \$2.00 (paper); \$3.00 (cloth).
- SARTORI, FRANCO. *La crisi del 411 A.C. nell'Athenaion Politeia di Aristotele*. ("Università di Padova, Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia," Vol. XXVI.) Padova: Cedam, Casa editrice Dott. Antonio Milani, 1951. Pp. viii + 135. L. 1000.
- SCULLARD, HOWARD H. *A History of the Roman World from 753 to 146 B.C.* 2d ed. rev. ("Methuen's History of the Greek and Roman World," Vol. IV.) London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1951. Pp. xiv + 470 + 4 maps. 32s. 6d.
- Studi Urbinati di Storia, Filosofia e Letteratura*, New Ser. B, Vol. XXV (1951), No. 1. Urbino: L'Università degli Studi. Pp. 116. L. 600.
- SINCLAIR, T. A. *A History of Greek Political Thought*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1952. Pp. viii + 317. 25s.
- SVENNUNG, J. *L'évolution de la préposition italienne da à partir de de ab dans le latin*. (Extrait de l'*Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* [Bulletin du Cange], Tome XXI, 1951, pp. 55-85.) Bruxelles: Secrétariat administratif de l'U.A.I., 1951.
- TARN, W. W. *The Greeks in Bactria and India*. 2d ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1952. Pp. xxiv + 562 + pl. + table + 3 maps. \$9.50.
- TRAVERSA, AUGUSTUS (ed.). *Hesiodi catalogi sive eorum fragmenta*. ("Collana di studi greci," Vol. XXI, ed. VITTORIO DE FALCO.) Napoli: Libreria Scientifica editrice, 1951. Pp. 209.
- WALDE, ALOIS, and HOFMANN, J. B. *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 3d ed. Lieferungen 17 and 18. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag, 1951. Pp. 433-512; 513-92. DM 4.65 each.
- WALDOCK, A. J. A. *Sophocles the Dramatist*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1951. Pp. x + 234. \$3.25.
- Živa antika (Antiquité vivante)*, Vol. I. ("Université de Skoplje, Faculté de philosophie.") Skoplje, 1951. 200 dinars a year.

ch
y,
w
1.

er-
ce,
ge
t.)
1.
a).
C.
le.
mi
ol.
ce
+

the
d.
nd
le-
70

te-
1),
di.

cal
an

on
in.
di
CI,
iat

nd
ge
62

ogi
udi
O.)
51.

a-
ed.
arl
3-

st.
ss,

I.
lo-
ar.